



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY



From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY



From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

A
GENERAL HISTORY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

TO THE
FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE

By **JOSEPH PRIESTLEY**, LL. D. F. R. S. &c.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

V O L. II.

THE SECOND EDITION IMPROVED.

των ευσεβείας αθλήων τας ενσας, και τους επι τουτοις
σεφανους εις αιωνιον μνημην ανακηρυττων.

EUSEBIUS.

NORTHUMBERLAND:—*Printed for the Author,*
By ANDREW KENNEDY.

FRANKLINS-HEAD, QUEEN STREET.

1804.

S.C.R.

BR

145

P75

1803

v. 2

C O N T E N T S

OF THE

S E C O N D V O L U M E.

P E R I O D VII.

From the Establishment of Constantine in the Empire A. D. 313, till his death A. D. 337	4
SECT. I. <i>Constantine's first Edict in Favour of Christianity, and of the Union of the Christi- an Church</i>	<i>ibid.</i>
SECT. II. <i>Of the Part which Constantine took in favour of the Christians against the Heathens</i>	7
SECT. III. <i>Of Constantine's Interference in the Business of the Donatists</i>	15
SECT. IV. <i>The History of the Arian Controversy till the Council of Nice</i>	19
SECT. V. <i>The History of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325</i>	37
SECT. VI. <i>From the Council of Nice A. D. 325, to the Death of Arius, A. D. 336</i>	57
SECT. VII. <i>Of the Measures of Constantine to suppress Heresy</i>	72
SECT. VIII. <i>Of the Circumstances attending the Death of Constantine A. D. 337</i>	82
VOL. II.	SECT.

iv. C O N T E N T S.

SECT. IX. Of Constantine's Conversion to Christianity	90
--	----

P E R I O D VIII.

From the Death of Constantine A. D. 337, to that of Constantius, A. D. 361	104
---	-----

SECT. I. General Observations on the State of Things in this reign	ibid.
---	-------

SECT. II. From the Beginning of the Reign of Constantius, A. D. 337, to the Council of Sardica, A. D. 347	111
--	-----

SECT. III. From the Council of Sardica A. D. 347, to the Death of the Emperor Constans A. D. 350	124
---	-----

SECT. IV. From the Death of Constans, A. D. 350 to that of Gallus, A. D. 354, including the Council of Sirmium against Photinus	132
--	-----

SECT. V. From the Death of Gallus A. D. 354, to the Council of Ariminum A. D. 359, including the rise of the ANOMOEANS, or those who, after Aetius, maintained that the Son was a Substance unlike that of the Father	143
--	-----

SECT. VI. Of the Councils of Ariminum and Selucia, A. D. 359.	152
--	-----

SECT. VII. Transactions relating to Arianism subsequent to the Council of Selucia, A. D. 359 and of the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 360	162
---	-----

SECT.

C O N T E N T S. v

SECT. VIII. <i>Of the Method by which the Trinitarians distinguished themselves from the Arians at Antioch ; and Observations on the Progress of Arianism in this Reign</i>	172
SECT. IX. <i>Of the Death and Character of Constantius</i>	181
SECT. X. <i>Of the Persecution of Christians in Persia, in the Reign of Constantius, A.D 343</i>	183
SECT. XI. <i>Of the Donatists in this Reign</i>	188
SECT. XII. <i>Of the Monks in this Reign</i>	189
SECT. XIII. <i>Of pretensions to miracles that began to be advanced and to gain credit chiefly at this Period</i>	191
SECT. XIV. <i>Of the Christian Writers from the Accession of Constantine, to the Death of Constantius</i>	208

P E R I O D IX.

The Reign of Julian	212
SECT. I. <i>General Observations</i>	ibid.
SECT. II. <i>Of the Superstition of Julian</i>	218
SECT. III. <i>Instances of Julian's Partiality for the Heathens, and his Prejudice against the Christians</i>	226
SECT. IV. <i>Julian's Artifices to subvert Christianity, and his Testimony in favour of it</i>	233
SECT. V. <i>Julian's more direct Attempts to undermine,</i>	

<i>dermine, and gradually to extirpate Christi-</i> <i>anity</i>	241
SECT. VI. <i>Violences committed upon Christians;</i> <i>in the Reign of Julian</i>	252
SECT. VII. <i>Of Julian's Expedition against</i> <i>Persia, and his Death</i>	261
SECT. VIII. <i>Of the Ecclesiastical Events of</i> <i>this Reign</i>	276

P E R I O D X.

<i>From the Death of Julian, A. D. 362, to that</i> <i>of Valens, A. D. 379</i>	283
SECT. I. <i>The Reign of Jovian, consisting of seven</i> <i>Months</i>	<i>ibid.</i>
SECT. II. <i>From the Accession of Valentinian and</i> <i>Valens, A. D. 364, to the Death of Athanasius</i> <i>A. D. 371, containing an Account of the Per-</i> <i>secution of the Catholics, and the moderate</i> <i>Arians by Valens</i>	298
SECT. III. <i>Of Basil the Great, and Gregory of</i> <i>Nazianzum, with the Change that took Place</i> <i>in the Doctrine of the Trinity chiefly by their</i> <i>Means</i>	317
SECT. IV, <i>Transactions in the West till the Death</i> <i>of Valentinian, A. D. 375</i>	314
SECT. V. <i>From the Death of Valentinian, A. D.</i> <i>375, to that of Valens A. D. 379, containing</i> <i>an Account of the Controversy concerning the</i> <i>Holy</i>	

C O N T E N T S, vii.

<i>Holy Spirit, the Opinions of Apollinaris, and the Divination of some Heathen Philosophers, with a view to find who should be the next Emperor</i>	329
SECT. VI. <i>State of Sects in this Period</i>	340
SECT. VII. <i>Of the Contest for the See of Rome after the Death of Liberius, and the Corruption of the Clergy in that City</i>	347
SECT. VIII. <i>Of the Council of Laodicea</i>	350
SECT. IX. <i>Of the Writers in the Time of Valens</i>	352

P E R I O D XI.

From the Death of Valens, A. D. 378, to that of Theodosius, A. D. 395. 357.

SECT I. *Of the State of Things at the Accession of Theodosius, and his Determination in Favour of what was deemed the Orthodox Faith* ibid

SECT. II. *Of the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381* 382

SECT. III. *Other Endeavours of Theodosius to support the Catholic Faith* 369

SECT. IV. *Transactions of a mixed Nature, civil and religious, with an Account of Theodosius's Death and Character* 375

SECT. V. *Of Heathenism in this Period* 384

SECT.

VOL. II.

viii C O N T E N T S.

SECT. VI. <i>Of the Priscillianists, and Unitarians in this Period</i>	394
SECT. VII. <i>Of the Arians and Novatians in this Reign</i>	401
SECT. VIII. <i>Of the Donatists in this Reign</i>	405
SECT. IX. <i>Of the Variety of Customs among Christians in this Period</i>	407
SECT. X. <i>Of a Change in the Discipline of the Eastern Churches in this Reign</i>	413
[SECT. XI. <i>Of the Ornaments of Churches, and of Festivals, and the increase of Superstition in this Period</i>	416

P E R I O D XII.

From the Death of Theodosius, A. D. 395, to that of Honorius, A. D. 424 422

SECT. I. *From the Accession of Arcadius, A. D. 395, to the Deposition of Chrysostom, A. D. 403* *ibid*

SECT. II. *From the Deposition of Chrysostom, A. D. 403, to his Death, A. D. 407, and that of Arcadius A. D. 408* 434

SECT. III. *Of the Disturbances in Egypt* 441

SECT. IV. *An outline of the political Events of the Reign of Honorius* 445

SECT. V. *Events relating to Heathenism* 449

SECT. VI. *Of the Arians in this Period* 453

SECT. VII. *Of the Novatians* 457

SECT.

C O N T E N T S: ix.

SECT. VIII. <i>Of the Donatists</i>	459
SECT. IX. <i>Of the Pelagian Controversy</i>	462
SECT. X. <i>Of the Writers in the Time of Theodosius and his Sons</i>	474

P E R I O D XIII

From the Death of Honorius, A. D. 424, to
the fall of the Western Empire, A. D.
475 482

SECT. I. <i>Of the Nestorian Controversy, till the Council of Ephesus</i>	ibid.
SECT. II. <i>Of the Council of Ephesus, and the Consequences of it</i>	489
SECT. III. <i>Of the Eutychian Controversy till the Death of Theodosius II. A. D. 456</i>	495
SECT. IV. <i>Of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D.</i>	451 500
SECT. V. <i>The Consequences of the Council of Chalcedon till the Death of Marcian, A. D.</i>	457 505
SECT. VI. <i>Transactions relating to Eutychianism, subsequent to the Accession of Leo, the Thracian, A. D. 474</i>	510
SECT. VII. <i>General Observations on the four Oecumenical Councils</i>	515
SECT. VIII. <i>Transactions of a civil Nature in the West, from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the Empire</i>	520
	SECT.

*** C O N T E N T S :**

SECT. IX. <i>Transactions of an Ecclesiastical Nature in the West, from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the Western Empire</i>	524
SECT. X. <i>Of the Writers within this Period</i>	528
<i>A View of the Succession of the Roman Emperors, and of the Bishops in the greater Sees to the Fall of the Western Empire</i>	533
<i>Index</i>	539

A
GENERAL HISTORY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

P E R I O D VII.

FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CONSTAN-
TINE IN THE EMPIRE A. D. 313, TILL HIS
DEATH A. D. 337.

WE have now seen the full establish-
ment of the power of Constantine, in conjunction
with Licinius, by the deaths of Maxentius and
Maximin. I shall now proceed to recite all the
subsequent transactions, in which the power of the
state was employed in the affairs of the church,
that we may have a distinct view of the situation
of the two rival powers, *christianity* and *heathen-*
ism, and also of the different sects of christians
from the beginning, to the end of this important
reign.

S E C-

SECTION I.

*Constantine's first Edict in Favour of Christianity
and of the Union of the Christian church.*

THE first edict of Constantine and Licinius in conjunction, was issued from Milan, A. D. 313. By this liberty was given to every person to profess, unmolested, which ever of the two religions he pleased. It was also provided, that the places of public worship, and any other kind of property which had belonged to the christians, but of which they had been deprived in the late persecution, should be restored to them; and that if any part of their property had been given to others, indemnification should be made to them out of the public treasury.* This was afterwards confirmed by Constantine in a rescript addressed to Anulinus, the proconsul of Africa†.

By another rescript, addressed to the same Anulinus, the christian clergy were exempted from all civil offices, that they might attend without distraction, to their spiritual functions‡.

Besides

* Euseb. Hist. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 480.

† Ibid. Hist. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 483.

‡ Ibid. Cap. 7. p. 487.

Besides allowing the christians the full exercise of their religion, and restoring to them whatever they had been deprived of in the late persecution, Constantine likewise ordered large sums of money to be given to the more eminent of the bishops, to defray such expences as they should deem to be most necessary. A letter of this kind, addressed to Cæcilianus bishop of Carthage, is preserved in Eusebius*. In it Constantine informs him, that Ursus, the treasurer of Africa, had received orders to grant him three thousand *folles* or *purses* (each supposed to contain three pounds and an half of silver) and saying that if any thing more was wanting, he should apply to Heraclides his steward, and receive it of him. In this letter Constantine likewise informs Cæcilianus, that he had heard of the catholic church in Africa being disturbed by a faction, and that he had given orders to Anulinus the proconsul, and to Patricius, the deputy of the præfect, to attend to this business, and to act in it with vigour ; and that, if he found any more refractoriness in the party that was hostile to him, he must give information of it to those officers who would act in it according to his orders.

Constantine had certainly the best intentions in this business, and in every thing else that he attempted of a similar nature, and never imagined that

* Euseb. Cap. 6. p. 486.

6 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. V.

that he was going beyond the bounds of his proper province, and still less beyond his power, in his endeavours to heal the divisions of the christian church. Had he adhered to his first edict, by which he gave liberty to all persons to profess, and to practise, whatever religion they pleased, all had been well ; but by interposing his own civil authority in matters of religion, he, unknown to himself, was laying the foundation for such an union of civil and ecclesiastical power, as in after ages produced infinite mischief in the world, corrupting that religion to which he was a well-wisher, and doing whatever was in the power of man to render those corruptions perpetual. We shall soon see the issue of this first attempt that was ever made by any christian prince to put an end to difference of opinion among christians ; but we must first attend to the similar measures with respect to the heathen religion, and then to other differences among christians of more importance than this.

S E C.

S E C T I O N II.

Of the Part which Constantine took in Favour of the Christians against the Heathens.

BESIDES the edict for the toleration of the christian religion, the restoration of whatever had belonged to the churches, and the largesses to different places, according to their occasions, Constantine did all that was in the power of man to do in favour of those who had suffered in the persecution. Those who had been banished were recalled ; those who had been condemned to the mines, or any other drudgery, were set at liberty ; those who had been degraded, were restored to their honours ; or if they did not chuse to resume their former offices, they were permitted to enjoy the profits of them, and to live as they pleased*. The goods and estates of the martyrs which had been confiscated, were all restored to their natural heirs, or if no heirs could be found, to the churches ; and in whatever manner the property had been disposed of, or through whatever hands it had passed, the public treasury was responsible for it†.

The

* Vita Const. Lib. ii. Cap 20. p. 546.

† Ibid. Cap. 21. p. 546.

8 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VII.

The christianity of Constantine naturally enough led him to examine into the state of Christ's sepulchre, and finding that it had been buried under heaps of rubbish, and that a temple of Venus had been erected on the place, he ordered it to be cleared ; and the sepulchre itself being found uninjured, he built over it a magnificent christian church*. He also built a church at Bethlehem, in honour of our Savior's nativity, and another on the mount of Olives, the place from which he ascended to heaven. These churches were built at the particular request of his mother Helena, a woman of great piety and benevolence, who afterwards visited the churches, and ornamented them.† He also commissioned Eusebius bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, to build a church at Mamre, the place where God appeared to Abraham‡. The building of churches in these particular situations, discovers the superstition of the age, from which Constantine was far from being exempt. Besides these he built a magnificent church at Nicomedia, and in other cities of the empire§.

With respect to Constantinople, the place of his residence, he not only built in it many magnificent

* Vita Lib. iii, Cap. 25. p. 593, &c.

† Ibid. Cap. 41, &c. p. 600, &c.

‡ Ibid. Vita Const. Lib. iii, Cap. 52, &c. p. 607, &c.

§ Ibid. Cap. 50, p. 605.

Sec. II. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 9

ficent churches, but (ὅλη ἐμπνεῶν Θεοῦ σοφίας) *wholly inspired by the wisdom of God*, as Eusebius says (but as he ought rather to have said, taking upon him to do what ought to have been left to God himself) he abolished all idolatry within its precincts, so that no trace of the heathen worship, no temple, altar, sacrifice, or festival, remained in it*

The sooner to abolish Paganism, he took away the vestibules, or doors, from some of the temples, and the roofs from others. Some brazen images, which had been revered by the superstition of ages, he removed from their former situations into the public market place. Here you might see the Pythian Apollo, says Eusebius, and there the Sminthian. The sacred tripods of Delphos were placed in the Circus, and the Muses of Helicon in the palace, so that the whole city of Constantinople was filled with the best statues, collected from all the provinces; and those images to which hecatombs had once been sacrificed, were now exposed to public ridicule.

So little was there of zeal for the heathen religion left, that to do all this, Constantine had no occasion to employ an army. He only sent his pious friends, to make the circuit of the provinces; and wherever they came, they did every thing they wished to do without the least danger,

VOL. II.

B

even

• Vita Cap. 48. p. 604.

even from the mob. They obliged the priests to produce their idols, and stripping them of their gorgeous dresses, publicly exposed their interior deformities. Taking off the precious metals with which some of them were covered, they melted them into useful utensils; but things that could not be converted to any use, they left to be exposed, as monuments of ridiculous superstition.*

Constantine totally demolished a temple of Venus at Aphaca on Mount Libanus, a place remote from any city, and infamous for the impure rites of prostitution and sodomy†. In the same manner he treated a celebrated temple of Æsculapius at Ægæ in Cilicia‡, and a much more celebrated temple at Heliopolis in Syria, where the most abominable prostitutions had been practised in honor of Venus, and he erected a handsome church in the place§.

Our historian observes, that when the heathens saw all this to be done with impunity, and that the soldiers entered without fear, and without danger, into the most sacred recesses of their temples, and exposed to light what had long been concealed in darkness, many of them were convinced of the folly of their ancient religion, and became christians.

* Vita Const. Lib. iii. Cap. 64, p. 609.

† Ibid. Const. Lib. iii. Cap. 55, p. 610.

‡ Ibid. Cap. 56. p. 611.

§ Ibid. Cap. 58. p. 613.

tians*. In many places the people of their own accord, destroyed their temples, and built christian churches in their place†.

At length Constantine ordered all the heathen temples to be shut up, and forbade all sacrifices to the heathen gods through all the Roman empire‡.

He particularly forbade all the secret rites of initiation, all the arts of divination, and the spectacles of gladiators. Whereas the Egyptians imagined that the increase of the Nile depended upon some religious ceremonies in which sodomy was practised, he abolished those abominable rites; and it was observed that when some superstitious heathens imagined that the Nile would not overflow as usual, it even rose higher after this.§ Thus Constantine acted the part of a bishop with respect to things out of the church (a title which he pleasantly gave himself when he entertained the bishops at his table) while they were bishops with respect to things within the church||. In this character he acted when he forbade any Jew to have a christian slave, but more especially when, by his imperial authority, he enforced all the decrees of the councils**.

It

* Vita Cap. 57. p. 612.

† Ibid. Lib. iv. Cap. 39, p. 647,

‡ Ibid, Cap. 23, p. 638.

§ Ibid Const. Lib. iv. Cap. 25. p. 639.

|| Ibid, Cap. 24, p. 638.

** Ibid, Cap. 27, p. 640.

❖ THE HISTORY OF THE. PAR. VII.

It is pleasing, however, to find that, notwithstanding the zeal of Constantine in favour of christianity, and against heathenism, we do not read of his offering violence to the person of any man ; owing perhaps not so much to his lenity, as to the general indifference of the heathens with respect to their religion, in consequence of their having no attachment to it but what arose from their having been educated in it, and a confused idea that the observance of its rites was, in some unknown manner connected with their temporal prosperity. They did not pretend to have any proper *evidence* of its truth, and they shewed their zeal for it only by persecuting the christians, and not by their readiness to suffer any thing themselves ; so different was the operation of their zeal and that of the christians ; a difference which can only be accounted for from the christians knowing, and being fully persuaded of, the great truths for which they suffered, as being founded on evident facts, for which they could produce the clearest historical evidence ; whereas the heathens could say nothing in favour of their religion, but that it had been practised by their ancestors, on what grounds they could not tell.

It is evident, however, from the subsequent history, that the edicts of Constantine were by no means carried into rigid execution, for the heathen worship was continued in most places, and especially

ally in the villages ; the common and illeterate people, who have the least intercourse with the world, and who are the least disposed to speculate, being always the last to change their opinions or practices. On this account the heathens being for the most part to be found in the villages, and not in the cities, they got the name of *pagani* *pagans*, from *pagus*, a village.

It is evident from the life of Constantine by Eusebius*, that all who chose to worship the heathen gods were at liberty to do it ; and in his oration addressed to the christians†, he bids the heathens go to their sacrifices, festivals, and debauches if they chose it ; telling them, however, that under the pretence of celebrating their sacred rites, they only indulged their own lusts.

Constantine did real service to christianity by writing to Sapor, king of Persia, in favour of the christians in his kingdom, of whom he had been informed there were great numbers, but where they had probably been much persecuted at different times, as well as in all the provinces of the Roman empire, and indeed wherever they were settled, though we have no particular account of their sufferings, or of the number of martyrs among them. But the spirit of heathenism, and also that of christianity, being the same in all places,

we

* Euseb. Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 56, p. 563.

† Ibid, Cap, 11. p. 688.

we may safely conclude that the treatment of the christians in one country was in general pretty much the same in all the rest. In this letter he informs the Persian monarch, that by the help of God he had established the true religion from the utmost boundary of the West, and through all the provinces of his empire; that in the captivity of Valerian, and in the overthrow of persecuting emperors over whom he had triumphed, God had shewn himself to be the enemy of haughtiness, superstition, and cruelty. He concludes with expressing his satisfaction in hearing of the multitude of christians there were in his dominions, and recommending them to his favour and protection*.

As a proof that Sapor had nothing to fear from tolerating, or embracing, christianity, the argument of Constantine was, no doubt, very proper; but he mistook the nature of christianity if he imagined that (excepting peace of mind and inward satisfaction) any part of the rewards of it are in this life.

In this letter there is no allusion to any persecution of the christians by Sapor, and whether he had exercised any severities against them at this time does not appear; but afterwards he carried on a very cruel persecution of them, of which an account will be given in the reign of Constantius, though Sozomen refers it to the time of Constantine.

S E C.

* Vita Const. Lib. iv, Cap 9, p. 631, &c.

S E C T I O N . III.

Of Constantine's Interference in the Business of the Donatists.

WHEN Constantine wrote the letter above-mentioned, the famous Donatus, from whom the whole sect was denominated, had succeeded Majorinus ; and the Donatists, perceiving that they were aimed at in the letter, and being much offended at it, applied to the proconsul to depose Cæcilianus, and to give the bishopric of Carthage to Donatus. But he, not chusing to act by his own authority, referred them to the emperor, who appointed three bishops of Gaul or Germany, and Militades, bishop of Rome, to hear and decide in the case. At the same time he wrote to Militades a letter which is preserved by Eusebius*, in which he expresses his concern that the christians, and their bishops, should be divided among themselves; and informs him that he had given orders that Cæcilianus, with ten bishops to be named by himself, and ten others chosen by the Donatists, should go to Rome, and that he had appointed that he, and three other bishops should examine into the affair, and

* Hist. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 484.

and decide between them ; saying, that such was his concern for the most holy catholic church, that he would not suffer any schism to remain in it.

In consequence of this, the ten bishops of each class repaired to Rome ; and Miltiades having called a council of fifteen other bishops of Italy, they, in conjunction with three others particularly appointed by the emperor, heard the complaints of the Donatists against Cæcilianus, and not only acquitted him, but passed a censure on Donatus for having rebaptized catholics, and for having ordained bishops who had apostatized in the late persecution.

With this decision the Donatists were by no means satisfied, and they applied again to the emperor, complaining of the partiality of those who had been judges in their cause. On this Constantine sent two bishops to Carthage to see if the difference might not be compromised on the spot ; but they returned without having seen any reason to condemn the decision of the council of Italy, though without having been able to give any satisfaction to the Donatists. Constantine then condescended to hear the parties himself at Brescia, but neither was he able to accommodate their differences.

The disturbance increasing, rather than being lessened, after the return of the parties to Africa, Constantine ordered a general council to meet at
Arles ;

Arles ; and one of his letters on this subject, addressed to the bishop of Syracuse, is preserved by Eusebius*. In it he informs him of the steps which he had taken to heal this breach, and that since the Donatists (whom he does not mention by name, but by a description which shews that he was much displeased with them) had complained of the small number of bishops who had decided against them before, he had summoned a greater number to judge in the case ; and therefore ordered that he, and two of his presbyters and three servants, travelling at the public expence, should meet his brethren at Arles, on the calends of August following.

Accordingly, two hundred bishops attended, one of whom was Restitutus from London, and Martin, the bishop of Arles, presided in it. In this council, held A. A. 314, Cæcilianus was acquitted, and the Donatists condemned again. But even this solemn decision did not put an end to the schism. The Donatists appealed once more to the emperor himself ; and two years after this, viz. A. D. 316, he gave them another hearing, at Milan, or Arles, when he again declared Cæcilianus innocent, and ordered that they should give him no farther trouble on the subject. But they complaining, and perhaps justly, that the emperor had been prepossessed by their enemies

VOL. II.

C

and

* Hist. Lib. x. Cap. 5. p. 485.

18 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VIII.

and indeed all his orders respecting this business sufficiently shew it) returned to Africa in as bad temper as ever. They even violently seized upon a church which had belonged to the catholics, but probably one of which they had been unjustly dispossessed. This Constantine ordered to be restored, and moreover intended to go in person to Africa, to put a final end to this schism, which had given him so much trouble. But this not being convenient to him, he contented himself with giving orders that all the Donatists should be banished.

Afterwards, finding that this harsh measure had been productive of more mischief than good, and perhaps being, upon reflection, more favourably disposed towards the Donatists, he relented in their favour, and A. D. 321, recalled them from banishment, but without permitting them to build churches, or to hold any public assemblies. In consequence of this the Donatists, who considered themselves as in a state of persecution, and did not chuse to abandon the exercise of their religion, were obliged to live in the mountainous parts of the country, where, in a course of time, many of them degenerated into a kind of banditti, and got the name of *Circumcelliones*. Then, considering themselves as exiles from their country, they committed the most horrid depredations on
the

SEC. IV. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 19

the inhabitants of the plains ; though it is probable that the accounts of these disorders are much exaggerated by their enemies, from whom alone we have all we know of them.

This was the first attempt of a christian emperor to decide a controversy in religion, and the issue shews how very unpromising the precedent was. However the intention of Constantine was unquestionably good.

SECTION IV.

The History of the Arian Controversy till the Council of Nice.

IN the course of this period of my history there arose a controversy in the christian church, the consequences of which were far greater, both with respect to extent and duration, than those of any that were of a merely speculative nature, from the origin of christianity to the present day. The commotion occasioned by it was so sudden, and spread so fast, that Eusebius compares it to a large conflagration

conflagration arising from a small spark. Beginning at Alexandria, it presently spread over all Egypt, the extreme parts of Thebais, and Lybia, and then over other cities and provinces ; so as not only to divide the bishops, and engage them in eager controversy, as with swords, says our historian, but the common people also ; some of them taking part with one side, and some with the other. The scandal it gave was so great, that it even furnished a subject for comedy on the theatres of the heathens*.

This was the famous *Arian controversy* relating to the person of Christ. And it is not a little remarkable, that christians should have interested themselves more to determine who Christ was, than what he did, or taught ; which, as a prophet, or a messenger from God to man, it certainly most concerns his professed disciples to inform themselves of.

Till this period we have seen only three distinct opinions concerning Christ. The first, and by universal confession the oldest, that of his being simply a man, the Messiah of the Jews. The second was that of the Gnostics, who thought him to be a superangelic spirit, either superadded to a man, or assuming only the appearance of one. The third was that of the platonizing Fathers, who thought that, to the man Jesus, who consisted

of

* Vita Const. Lib. iii, Cap 61, p. 565.

of a body and soul, like other men, there was superadded not a superangelic spirit (which had the same origin with other derived spiritual substances) but the *logos* of the Supreme Being himself, a principle that was uncreated, and properly divine.

This attribute was supposed to have been originally the same with respect to God, that *reason* is with respect to man ; but that it had been detached from him, as a ray of light from the sun, first for the purpose of creating the material worlds, then to form those appearances with which the patriarchs were favoured, and lastly that it resided permanently in Jesus Christ ; so that, with respect to the superior part of his composition, he might be said to have existed before the creation of the world, though not long before that event. This, however, being before the commencement of what is usually called *time*, might be said to be, in the way of speaking which was customary in this period, *from eternity*. According to this system, Christ was God, and likewise the being who made the world, and who had been the medium of all the intercourse which the Divine Being had with it in all ages.

But in this period we find at least the principal elements of another distinct opinion concerning the person of Christ, viz. that the *logos* which was one part of him, was not an *uncreated* principle, but

but had been *made*, like other things, *out of nothing*, and was not superadded to a complete man, but was a proper soul to the body of Jesus. To this created logos, were ascribed all the functions of the uncreated one, viz. that of having made all things, and of having been the visible Jehovah of the Old Testament, or the medium of all the divine communications of God with mankind. We shall find, however, if we attentively consider the following history, that it was a long time, not less than half a century, before this new opinion was completely formed, and maintained by any considerable number of persons. For it is resolvable into several distinct parts, and the connexion there is between them was not distinctly perceived at first, so that they were adopted one after another, and were held with much inconsistency and hesitation, as has generally been the case with other new systems of doctrine.

Radically different as this opinion is from that of the platonizing Fathers, the learned world was in some measure prepared for it, by the gradual evanescence of the philosophical doctrine of the *emanation* of all spirits from the substance of God, which was thought to render him too much like material substances, and by the scriptural idea of a proper *creation out of nothing*, which philosophers had never admitted. Also the platonizing Fathers, in the apologies which they made for their
new

new doctrine of the divinity of Christ to the common people, had been led to speak of him as greatly inferior to the Father ; and in their controversies with the learned unitarians, they had even said that he was of a *different substance* from the Father ; the divinity of the Father and that of the Son not being *the same*, as the Sabellians were charged with making it.

Now it clearly followed, that if Christ was of a different substance from the Father, he could not be properly *divine*, but must have been *created* like other things, and, like them, *out of nothing*. And since it had always been supposed that the logos did not assume personality till just before the creation of the world, there must have been a time when he did not exist at all. These natural consequences, however, had not been attended to, but they gave a great advantage to the defenders of the new opinion, and contributed greatly to embarrass the advocates of that doctrine which, by the decision of councils, was deemed to be orthodox.

The little spark, as Eusebius calls it, which occasioned the great conflagration, arose as follows. Arius, a presbyter of the church of Alexandria, who excelled in logic (a science which was much cultivated by the learned of that age) having advanced an opinion concerning the person of Christ, which occasioned some dispute among the clergy,
Alexan-

Alexander, the bishop, at first neglected it ; but, at the persuasion of his friends, he at length gave both parties a hearing, and though towards the beginning of the conference he did not seem to favour one party more than the other, at length he took part against Arius. This is the account of Sozomen*.

But Socrates says, that as Alexander was discouraging in an ostentatious manner (*φιλοτιμοτερον*) on the subject of the trinity, in the presence of his presbyters, and (using philosophical language) said there was *an unity in the trinity* (*εν τριαδι μοναδα ειναι*) Arius, one of his presbyters, replied that such language favoured of Sabellianism, which undoubtedly it did ; for the Sabellians had always been charged with confounding the persons of the trinity, and making them to be only one.

In the course of the debate Arius likewise said, that if the Father begat the Son, there must have been a beginning of the Son's existence, and consequently a time when he was not. This was the language of standard orthodoxy, if by the existence of Christ was meant his existence *as a son*. For Tertullian, in conformity with the doctrine of his age, said, " There was a time when God was
 " neither a father nor a judge ; since he could not
 " be a father before he had a son, nor a judge before
 " there was sin." But the language of Arius was
 not

* Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 15. p. 31

not orthodox, if by the existence of Christ, or of the son, was meant that *principle*, or *attribute*, in the Father, which before the creation of the world became the son ; and therefore what Arius added, viz. that since there was a time when the son was not, he must have been created out of nothing, did not follow*.

Such was the doctrine that Arius advanced in this casual, but famous conference, which is supposed to have been held A. D. 315. What was at that time urged in defence of the old, or of the new opinion, is not recorded ; but the particulars being reported abroad, very great consequences soon followed. The opinion of Arius appeared so plausible, that it spread rapidly in Egypt, the Upper Thebais, and Lybia, and even to more distant places, especially in the East, where it was patronized by many, and especially by Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia, one of the most distinguished prelates of that age.

They who took the part of Arius at Alexandria were Aithalas, Achillas, Carpones, Sarmata, and another Arius, who were all presbyters, and Euzoius, Macarius, Lucius, Julianus, Menas, and Helladius, who were deacons. They were also joined by a great part of the laity of the city, and by Theonas and Secundus, bishops in Egypt.

VOL. II.

D

Alexan.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i. Cap. 5. p. 9.

† Ibid. Hist. Lib. i. Cap. 6. p. 11;

Alexander, offended at the great and unexpected popularity of his opponent, called a council of about an hundred bishops, in which the opinion of Arius was condemned, and himself and his friends of the clergy were degraded. Also, according to the custom of the times, he sent an account of the resolutions of this council to the bishops of distant sees. The letter is preserved in Socrates, and is to this effect.

After speaking of Arius as the forerunner of Antichrist, and warning those to whom he wrote against regarding any thing that should be said in his favour by Eusebius of Nicomedia (who he said had taken his part only to promote his own purposes) he mentions the followers of Arius in Egypt, and then gives an account of his faith ; as asserting that Christ was of a substance different from that of the Father, that there was a time when he was not ; that he was a creature, and not the true wisdom of the father ; that he was liable to change like other creatures ; that he does not perfectly know the Father, who was invisible to him ; that he was not able perfectly to comprehend himself, that he was made for our use (viz, that by his means God might create us) and that he might even change for the worse, as the devil had done.

In this account there is either much exaggeration, or the bishop must have taken advantage of expressions

SEC. IV. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 27

expressions which dropped from Arius in the heat of debate, and which he retracted afterwards.

In answer to these positions, real or supposed, of Arius, the bishop proceeds to say, that they are inconsistent with what John says of the logos, which was in the beginning with God, and that all things that were created, by him, so that on his hypothesis the Son must have made himself; that he could not be made out of nothing, because it is said that the logos comes from the heart, the womb, or the substance of God; that he cannot be of a substance dissimilar to that of the Father, because he is said to be the express image of his person, and because he said *he that seeth me, seeth the Father*. If the Son was the reason and the wisdom of the Father, there could never be a time when he was not, for then God must have been without reason or wisdom; Christ could never have been liable to change, because he said *I am in the Father and the Father in me, I and the father are one*; and the apostle says of him, that he is *the same yesterday, to day, and for ever*. He must know the Father, because he expressly said *the Father knows me, and I know the Father*.

I mention these particulars of this letter, because they tend to explain the nature of the controversy, and are such arguments as were always alleged by the catholics against the Arians, and therefore need not be repeated on any future occasion.

sion. The bishop concludes his circular letter with violent invectives against Arius and his followers, and again warning all persons against paying any regard to what Eusebius of Nicomedia might write in his favour*.

Alexander, seeing that Arius was not discouraged by his degradation and excommunication, but that he and his friends formed separate congregations, wrote a longer letter on the subject to Alexander bishop of Constantinople, in which he complains of being even persecuted by the Arians (which implies that their numbers were very great) and in which he argues much more largely against their opinions. But as in this letter he says that their doctrine was the same with that of Ebion, Artemas, Paulus Samosatensis, and Lucian of Antioch, in which he was certainly mistaken, it is the more probable that there might be some misrepresentation in the first account that he gave of the opinions of Arius. To the same purpose he wrote to Philogonius bishop of Antioch, and to Eustathius bishop of Berea†.

On the other hand, Arius in vindication of himself, wrote to his friend Eusebius of Nicomedia, complaining of his persecution by Alexander, for not assenting to the following assertions, viz. That the Son was always, that he existed in God in an
unbe-

* Socratis Lib. 1. Cap. 6. p. 10.

† Theodoreti Hist. Lib. 1 Cap. 4, p. 9.

SEC IV. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 29

unbegotten state, that he was always begotten ($\alpha\epsilon\iota\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\varsigma$, $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$) that the father did not precede the Son a single moment, and that he derived his being from the substance of God himself. He says that all the bishops of the East agreed with him in saying that God, who alone was ($\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\textcircled{\circ}$) *without origin*, preceeded the Son, except Philogonius of Antioch, Hellanicus of Tripoli, and Macarius of Jerusalem, of whom the first said that the Son was an *eruption* from the Father, the second a *projection* from him, and the third he was equally with himself *unbegotten* $\alpha\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\lambda\omicron\nu$; impieties, which he says he could not bear, though those heretics should threaten him with a thousand deaths.

As to himself, he says, that he had always professed that the Son was not unbegotten ($\alpha\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\textcircled{\circ}$) in any sense, nor produced from any thing that pre-existed, but was made by the will of the Father before the ages, complete God, the only begotten, and immutable; but that he did not exist before he was begotten or created. I am persecuted, he adds, because I said the Son had an origin ($\alpha\rho\chi\eta\nu\ \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$) but God has none ($\alpha\nu\alpha\rho\chi\textcircled{\circ}$) that the Son is from the things that were not, not being part of God, or made of any pre-existing matter. Here I would observe, that Arius allows the title of God to the Son, though in an inferior sense, but denies what was laid to his charge of Christ being liable to

to change. In this letter Arius enumerates among his friends Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotus of Laodicca, Paulinus of Tyre, Athanasius of Anazarbus, Gregory of Berytus, and Ætius of Lydda*.

On receiving this letter, and after calling, it is said, a council of the bishops of Bythinia, in concurrence with them, Eusebius wrote to Paulinus bishop of Tyre, desiring that he would write to Alexander, not doubting the weight of his authority with him, and expressing his surprize at the novelty of his assertions, and the weakness of his reasons. “ We never heard,” he says “ of two
“ that were unbegotten, or of one being divided in-
“ to two, which would suppose them to be of a cor-
“ poreal nature ; but of one unbegotten, and ano-
“ ther produced by him, but not from his sub-
“ stance, or in any respect of the same nature with
“ him. We read in the scripture that Christ
“ was created, as when he says (Prov. [viii, 1) *God*
“ *created me in the beginning of his ways.* If the
“ term begotten must be understood of the deriva-
“ tion from the substance of God, other beings
“ have the same origin with Christ, for they are
“ said to be begotten by God, as Isa. 1. 2. *I have*
“ *begotten children.*†”

Arius

* Theodoret, Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 5, p. 22.

† Ibid. Hist. Lib. i, Cap. vi, p. 23.

SEC. IV: CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 31

Arius also and his friends wrote to Alexander, asserting that the doctrine which they held was the same that he himself had openly taught in their hearing, viz. that there is one God, who alone is unbegotten, immutable, &c, who begat his Son at his own pleasure, before all time, a perfect creature of God, though not like any other creature, and that when, at his creation, he imparted all glory to the Son, he could not be supposed to divest himself of his prerogative, of having all things originally in himself, for he is the fountain of all. There are therefore three hypostases, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit; but that though Christ was begotten before all time, he was not therefore eternal, or co-eternal with God; and that on the principle of Christ being of the same substance with the father God must be corporeal and divisible.

Almost all the language of this letter might have been used alike by the orthodox and the Arians. For the platonizing Fathers had frequently called the *generation* of the son a *creation*, and by the phrase *before all time* they meant before the creation of the world, but not properly *from all eternity*. They had also uniformly represented him as greatly inferior to the Father, and as having derived all things from him. But it is evident from their writings, that, notwithstanding this, they considered the Son as the personified reason
of

38 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VII.

of the Father, and therefore as *in him* properly eternal.

Eusebius of Nicomedia also wrote to Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, requesting at the same time, that they would permit Arius, and those of his friends who were of the rank of presbyters, to preach in congregations belonging to their churches, as was the custom in Alexandria. To this request the bishops above-mentioned, and also the other bishops of Palestine, consented.*

While Alexander and Arius were thus exerting themselves to strengthen their respective parties, all the christian world was full of contention, churches being divided against churches; and persons of the same neighbourhood and family were also divided, and exasperated against each other†.

The pious and well meaning emperor, for such undoubtedly he was, was deeply concerned that the religion which he had embraced should be disgraced by such altercations, on a subject, which, whether he well understood or not, at that time appeared to him to be of a very trifling nature, and that he might not neglect to do every thing in his power to prevent the farther spread of the mischief, he himself wrote to the parties concerned, by Ho-
sius

* Sonomeni, Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 15. p. 33.

† Ibid.

his bishop of Córdoba in Spain, one of the most respectable prelates of his age, and for whom the emperor had very justly a great esteem:

He begins with saying, that the great object of his reign was to accomplish two things, first to establish the uniform worship of God among all nations, and then to correct all abuses of a civil nature. The former of these he hoped to compass by address, and in the latter he meant to employ force; but he said that he should more easily accomplish the latter, if he could first succeed in the former. Then, having expressed the deep concern which the disturbances in Africa (meaning those concerning the Donatists) had given him, and the measures which he had taken to put an end to them, he observes that the dissensions which had now arisen among them were of a much more threatening nature than those; and yet that when he endeavoured to trace the cause of them, it appeared to him to be very inconsiderable. He therefore hoped, that by making himself a moderator in the dispute, it might be brought to an amicable termination.

He then blames both the parties, Alexander for proposing questions on such a difficult subject, and Arius for entering into the discussion of them; but he hoped that by mutual acknowledgments, and mutual forgiveness, they might be reconciled, especially, as in reality, they held the same opinions. He farther observed, that if philosophers

could adhere to the same sect, notwithstanding several differences of opinion, much more might christians hold communion with each other, notwithstanding such differences as were among them. He therefore earnestly entreated them to restore to him the tranquility of his days and nights, which had been much interrupted by this affair, and without which he should be overwhelmed with grief.

As a proof of this, he said, that it had been his intention to make a progress into the East, and that he had proceeded as far as Nicomedia (which was just after the defeat of Licinius, A. D. 324) but had been prevented from going any farther by the afflicting news of this dissension; not being able to bear the sight of that, which it had given him so much pain to hear of*.

No mode of address, it must be allowed, could have been better calculated to compose this difference than this of Constantine, especially as, at this time, he was careful not to exasperate either of the parties by declaring himself in favour of one more than the other, as perhaps he might think he had unfortunately done in the case of the Donatists. And he might naturally imagine, that, after so much as he had done in favour of the christian religion, it was not too much to expect that, in return, the ministers of it would oblige him by living in

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. ii. Cap. 64. &c. p. 567, &c.

in peace with one another, especially as, in his opinion, they had so little to contend about.

But in the eyes of the contending parties, the matter in question appeared in a very different light. As Eusebius observes, the business was of too great magnitude to be managed by a letter; and notwithstanding all the address of the emperor, the impression which a sense of his merits must have made upon their minds, and the apprehension which some of them might have of his power, the contention increased every day, till it inflamed all the provinces of the East*. If any thing in the following history can serve as a lesson to princes not to interfere in the business of religion and conscience, this may. No other prince can ever have so many or so great advantages for composing differences among christians as Constantine was possessed of; but he failed of gaining his end, as all others have done since.

In reply to this letter of Constantine, Alexander addressed one to him, but the contents of it are not mentioned†. Arius, no doubt, wrote likewise. The result was, that Constantine summoned Arius and his friends before him, when he was attended by some bishops, who were probably no friends of Arius. For Epiphanius says that, in this conference, Arius denied what was laid to his charge, and
that

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. ii, Cap. 73. p. 572.

† Epiph. Hær. 69. Sect. 9. Opera, Vol. 1, p. 734.

26. THE HISTORY OF THE P^{ART}. VII.

that Constantine said to him, "I trust that if thou
"dissemblest, or deniest any thing, thou wilt be
"detected by that God whom thou callest to wit-
ness."

It is also said that, though Eusebius of Nicomedia did every thing that he could in favour of Arius, the emperor some time after this conference wrote a long letter, addressed to Arius and his friends, but circulated through the empire, composed in the form of the most violent invective, in which Arius is called the very image of the devil, &c*. The whole of this letter Baronius says he found in Latin in the Vatican library, and he gives it at full length. It is so full of the grossest abuse, that if this emperor had not expressed himself in a similar manner on similar occasions, as we shall see in the course of this history, I should have concluded, without hesitation, that this letter had been composed by some of the catholic party a long time after the transaction; and I still own that I much doubt whether Constantine wrote this letter, at least in this stage of the business.

If there be any truth in what is related by Epiphanius, we must say that, by some means or other, Constantine had now taken his part, and that he was as decidedly against Arius, as he had been against Donatus, and consequently that all that he did afterwards was only a measure of his own to suppress

* Epiph. Her. 69, Sect. 9, Opera, Vol. 1, p. 734.

Sec. V. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 87

suppress what he thought to be a faction in the church; and from this we may judge of the temper with which the holy Fathers would meet him at Nice, and what justice Arius had to expect from them.

SECTION V.

The History of the Council of Nice, A. D. 325.

THE emperor, finding* that the letter which he had sent to Alexandria had produced no good effect, and deeply reflecting within himself on the subject, determined to make another war, as Eusebius says, against the invisible author of so much evil; and presently raising as it were a divine phalanx against him, convoked a general council, summoning the bishops from all quarters to attend him at Nice in Bythinia, as speedily as possible, and furnishing them, at the expence of the state, with every convenience for their journies. Upon this, he says, the hope of advantage, the convenience of the present peace, and the desire of seeing

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Cap. 5, p. 529.

38 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VII.

seeing so great an emperor, made them rush from their homes as chariots from a goal. Going, therefore, with so much eagerness to see the emperor, and with the hope of such favours as he alone could confer, there can be no doubt with respect to the previous dispositions of these bishops to comply with his wishes, whenever they should be known to them.

On this summons the chief of the bishops, says Eusebius (but by what rule the selection was made does not appear) flocked to Nice from all quarters of the Roman empire, from all the provinces of Asia Minor, from Thrace, Macedonia, Achaia, and Epirus ; from Cilicia, Syria, Phenicia, Arabia, Palestine, Egypt, Thebais, Lybia, and Mesopotamia ; one from Persia ; one, or perhaps more, from Sicily, and one from Spain, viz. the celebrated Hosius. The bishop of Rome could not attend on account of his age, but he sent presbyters to supply his place. In all, Eusebius says, there were above two hundred and fifty bishops ; that the presbyters, deacons, acolyths, and others, were without number, and that they were all entertained at the expence of the emperor.*

On

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. i. i. Cap. 7, 8, p. 579, &c.

Considering the great number of bishops in the christian church at this time, two hundred and fifty, or three hundred and eighteen, as they are more commonly

On the day appointed for the holding of the council, the bishops and all the inferior clergy above-mentioned were assembled in the largest room in the palace, rows of seats being placed on each side of it ; and all having taken their places, they waited standing in respectful silence for the emperor ; who, being preceded by several of his friends, at length made his appearance, as Eusebius says, like an angel of God, exceeding all his attendants
in

reckoned, was but a small portion of the whole, and is a circumstance that gives some degree of credit to the very different account given by Eutychius, who is said to have compiled his annals from the archives of the church of Alexandria. He says there were two thousand and forty-eight bishops assembled at Nice, and that Constantine, having heard their opinions, which were very various, but approving that of the three hundred and eighteen who held the same doctrine, he appointed them to meet in a large room, and gave them power to make decrees. The same account Selden, the publisher of Eutychius, found in an Arabian and christian writer named Joseph, and also in a celebrated Mahometan historian, Ismael Ebn Ali.

This account Beaufobre thinks may be reconciled with that given by the Greek writers, if it be supposed that the bishops of villages, presbyters, and those who were deemed to be heretical, were not allowed to have a seat with the rest. Wormius says, that no sectary was allowed to give his opinion in that council. *Histoire de Manichisme*, vol. i, p, 531.

in size, gracefulness, and strength, and dazzling all eyes with the splendor of his dress; but shewing the greatest humility and modesty in his manner of walking, gesture, and behaviour. Having taken his station in the middle of the upper part of the room, near a low chair that was covered with gold he did not sit down till the Fathers desired it.

All being now seated, the bishop, says Eusebius, whose place was the first at the right hand of the emperor (meaning, it is probable himself) rose;

Mr. Gibbon, collecting the account from Bingham, and others, says that the catholic church was governed by eighteen hundred bishops, of whom a thousand were seated in Greece, and eight hundred in the Latin provinces of the empire. Hist. Vol. ii, p. 213. And besides these, the number of *choræpiscopi*, or village bishops, must at that time have been very great. According to Bingham (Summary, Vol. i. p. 298) Basil some time after, had fifty of them under him; and, as Eusebius says, that presbyters, &c. without number attended those could not surely be excluded. That these presbyters, however, had no votes is evident, because the decrees were signed by no other than three hundred and eighteen bishops; and if they retired without making any remonstrances, that have come down to us, the inferior bishops may have done the same.

* Some think that it was Eustathius, who was first bishop of Beræa, and afterwards of Antioch, who made this speech.

rose ; and addressing the emperor, gave thanks to God on his account, probably congratulating the church on its prosperous condition, brought about by his means. Then he sitting down, the emperor himself addressed the company in Latin, expressing his happiness in seeing them all met on so glorious an occasion as the amicable settlement of all their differences, which, he said, had given him more concern than all his wars ; but that all these being at an end, he had nothing more at heart than to be the means of settling the peace of the church ; and he concluded with expressing his earnest wish that they would, as speedily as possible, remove every cause of dissension, and lay the foundation of a lasting peace. What he said in Latin was interpreted to the Fathers in Greek.

Immediately after this speech, this excellent emperor was witness to a scene which must have afforded him a very unpromising prospect as to the success of his project for peace. For before they entered upon the discussion of any thing that related to the great object of their meeting, the bishops began with complaining to the emperor of each other, and vindicating themselves ; but of what kind these mutual accusations were, our author does not say, but only that to every thing that was said the emperor gave a patient hearing, and that

by his mildness, and great address, speaking to them in Greek (which he was in some measure able to do) he at length prevailed upon them to come to an agreement, not only, adds our author, with respect to their private differences, but also with respect to the two great objects of their assembling, viz. the rule of faith (meaning what related to the Arian controversy) and the time of celebrating Easter*. This implies that the emperor attended all the debates of the council, which continued a considerable time, and that he took an active part in them.

Socrates says that the bishops, having put into the emperor's hands written libels containing their complaints against each other, he threw them all together into the fire, advising them, according to the doctrine of Christ, to forgive one another, as they hoped to be forgiven themselves†. Sozomen says, that the bishops having made their complaints in person, the emperor bade them reduce them all into writing, and that on the day which he had appointed to consider them, he said, as he threw all the billets unopened into the fire, that it did not belong to him to decide the differences of christian bishops, and that the hearing of them must be.

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. iii, Cap. 13. 14 p. 584.

† Hist. Lib. i. Cap. 8, p. 29.

be deferred till the day of judgment*. Accord-
ing to any of these accounts, the story gives us a
favourable opinion of the emperor, but a very un-
favourable one of these christian bishops, who,
after a time of grievous persecution, had learned no
more of the christian temper than they appear to
have done, and whose mutual animosities were so
great, that they could not prevent them from break-
out on this solemn occasion, in the presence of
the emperor himself.

When the chief subject, for the decision of
which they were assembled, came to be debated,
the principal persons who appeared on the side of
Arius, who was also present himself, were Euse-
bius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice and, Maris
of Chalcedon ; and the person who chiefly oppos-
ed them, and who will make a great figure in the
subsequent part of this history, was Athanasius,
then only a deacon of the church of Alexandria,
but much confided in by Alexander the bishop.
But it is probable that in this, as in almost every
other public transaction, every thing of conse-
quence was previously settled by the principal
actors, who were in the confidence of the em-
peror.

According to Philostorgius, Alexander bishop
of Alexandria, and Hosius of Corduba (who is
well

* Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 17, p. 35.

well known to have been in the good graces of the emperor) meeting with some others at Nicomedia, settled among themselves, that in the ensuing council, Christ should be declared to be *consubstantial* with the Father, and that Arius should be banished.*

It is said that after the Fathers in this council had debated some time in the forms of logic, a plain layman, a confessor, stood up and observed that Christ and the apostles did not speak in this manner, but preached faith and good works ; and by this he is said to have silenced the logicians. But certainly they had occasion for all their logic to compose such a creed as they at length determined upon. In what manner the debate proceeded till they came to this agreement is not known, but the creed itself, as far as we are at present concerned in it, is as follows :

“ I believe in one God, the Father, Almighty,
 “ maker of heaven and earth, and of all things vi-
 “ sible and invisible ; and in one Lord Jesus Christ,
 “ the only begotten Son of God, begotten of his Fa-
 “ ther before all worlds, God of God, Light of
 “ Light, very God of very God, begotten not made,
 “ being of one substance with the Father, by whom
 “ all things were made, &c.”

To this creed was subjoined the following anathema, “ The catholic and apostolic church of God
 “ ana-

* Hib. Lib. i, Cap. 7. p. 478.

“ anathematizes those who say that there ever was
 “ a time when the Son was not, or that he did not
 “ exist before he was generated, or that he was
 “ made out of nothing, or out of any other sub-
 “ stance, or that he is subject to change*.”

The clauses in this creed which are particular-
 ly opposed to the opinions of Arius are those
 which assert that Christ was not properly *made*, so
 as to come under the denomination of a *creature*,
 but that he was *begotten*; and that his essence or
 substance was the very same with that of the Fa-
 ther himself. By their asserting that he was *be-*
gotten before all worlds they also probably meant to
 decide against Arius, who said that there was a time
 when the Son was not. But, as I have observed
 already, the phrase is indeterminate, since it may not
 express a proper eternity, but only the indefinite
 space before the commencement of what they call
time, or the creation of the world. At the same
 time, by saying that Christ was only *God of God*,
 and *light of light*, the Fathers of this council shew
 that, in their opinion, his divinity was derived
 from the Father; and that he was not (*απαρχῆς*)
without origin or (*αὐτοῦ θεοῦ*) *God of himself*, as
 the Father was; so that they had no idea at this
 time of Christ being properly *equal* to the Fa-
 ther. We shall not find this language, or any
 thing

* Niceph. Hist. Lib. 8. Cap. 17. p. 568.

thing equivalent to it, till a later period in our history.

This famous creed was signed by three hundred and eighteen bishops. Philostorgius says that Secundus of Ptolemais, who with Theonas bishop of Marmarica refused from the first to subscribe the Nicene creed, told Eusebius of Nicomedia, that he had subscribed only for fear of banishment; but that God had revealed to him that notwithstanding this, he would be banished within a year; and accordingly three months after this, Eusebius was banished*. As the orthodox made great boasts of their miracles, we see that the Arians also were not without pretensions of the same kind.

Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, Theonas of Marmarica, Secundus of Ptolemais, Menophantus of Ephesus, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Narcissus of Neconias, a city of the second Cilicia, afterwards called Irenopolis†, the friends of Arius, being desirous that their resolutions might be unanimous, presented a creed, in which no use was made of the term *consubstantial*, but which, in every other respect, expressed the sentiments of the enemies of Arius. They had no objection to saying that Christ was a *true God, God of God*, or that he was
not

* Hist. Lib. 1, Cap. 9, 10, p. 478.

† Niceph. Lib. viii, Cap. 18, Vol. i, 569

not a creature, but the power and wisdom of the Father, his eternal image, like to the Father, and unchangeable.

But Athanasius and his friends, supposing that they did this on the idea that all these expressions might be used with respect to a man; and with a view to cut off all their subterfuges, that is, in fact, intending to express themselves in such a manner as they knew that the other party could not concur with them, with great indignation tore the paper on which it was written, and introduced that obnoxious term*; though they acknowledged it not to be a scripture phrase; alleging, that their adversaries also made use of expressions which were not

* That the enemies of Arius introduced this term, as one that the Arians could not adopt, is acknowledged by Ambrose, De Fide, Lib iii, Cap. 7. Opera Vol. iii, p. 159. However, meaning, as they did, to condemn the doctrine of Arius, there was no other way of doing it, than by such language as the Arians could not adopt. To compose a creed which all parties might equally subscribe, would have answered no purpose at all. The scriptures would then have been sufficient. It would have been happy, indeed, if this would have satisfied the contending parties; but for this purpose there would have been no occasion for the council of Nice. Being assembled for a particular purpose, it was consistent not to separate without gaining that purpose. They would else have incurred the ridicule of their adversaries.

48 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VII.

not to be found in the scriptures, as that the Son was made *out of nothing*, &c. Willing, however, to agree with their brethren, and dreading, no doubt, the resentment of the emperor, whose disposition and resolution were by this time sufficiently apparent, they all consented to admit that term, except Theonas of Marmarica, and Secundus of Ptolemais, who were therefore excommunicated along with Arius*.

Eusebius of Cæsarea hesitated, but at length he subscribed the creed ; and when he sent a copy of it to his church, he explained the meaning of the word at which he had demurred ; saying that by *consubstantial* was not meant that Christ was any part of the Father, so as to imply that the Father was corporeal, and had been divided. He also said that by the phrase *begotten, not made*, was only meant that Christ was of a nature different from that of those creatures which he himself had made, and more excellent than they. That these phrases were to be understood in these senses, was, he said, the opinion of the emperor, and of the Fathers themselves. As to the *anathema*, he said it was nothing more than a condemnation of all unscriptural phrases, which had produced almost all the confusion and sedition in churches†.

However,

* Niceph. Hist. Lib. viii, Cap. 21, Vol. i, p. 571, from the writings of Eustathius and Athanasius.

† Niceph. Hist. Lib. viii, Cap. 22, p. 578, 583.

However, as the two bishops above mentioned were not able to satisfy themselves in this manner, and therefore refused to subscribe the creed ; and as the council ordered that Arius, and all who thought as he did, should be excommunicated, and that he should not be permitted to enter Alexandria ; the emperor, in giving his sanction to their decrees, sent both of them, as well as Arius himself, and the rest of his adherents, among whom was Euzoius, into banishment*.

In this council it was also decided, and, as far as appears, unanimously, that Easter should be observed not in the Jewish manner, on the fourteenth day of the month, but on the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox, which had been the custom of all the western churches. Even this want of uniformity in the practice of christians had given serious disturbance to the mind of Constantine, who had conceived that the christian religion would not appear to advantage with this variety in the customs of its professors.

We have seen in the account of the origin of the monks, that superstition had already given uncommon merit to several acts of austerity, and especially to celibacy. By this time the idea of a kind of impurity was annexed to the commerce of the sexes, and it was thought particular-

ly unfuitable to the clerical character. At this solemn council it was proposed, that those who should be chosen bishops, presbyters, or deacons, after they were married, should from that time abstain from all commerce with their wives. But this proposal was over-ruled by Paphnutius, a bishop of Upper Thebais, and an old confessor, one of whose eyes had been put out in the late persecution. and whom, on that account, the emperor held in high veneration. Marriage, said this venerable old man, is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled, and commerce with a lawful wife is real chastity. He added, that the chastity of the divorced wives would be in danger and that it was sufficient, that a man should not be permitted to marry after he should be chosen into the body of the clergy. To this all assented, and Paphnutius was allowed to have the more merit on this occasion, as he had never been married, and, being educated a monk, had distinguished himself by his perfect chastity.*

The great object of this council being to put an end to all differences of opinion or practice among christians, and as far as possible, to prevent all dissensions in future, the members of it came to a decision concerning the Meletians, and to appearance with a great prospect of success. For Meletius himself acceded to their decision, which was that he should remain at Lycopolis, with the
title

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 11, p. 38.

title of bishop, but without the functions, and that all those who had been ordained by him should be re-ordained to the same rank by other bishops.

Another great object of the council was to settle the rights of the bishops of different sees ; and it was agreed that every bishop should be ordained by at least three of the bishops of the same province, and that the election should be confirmed by the bishops of the metropolis. This was regulated according to the division of provinces in the Roman empire, and seems to be explained by another canon of this council, which says that to the bishop of Alexandria is given the superintendency of Egypt, Lybia and the Pentapolis according to ancient custom ; and that a similar jurisdiction is given to the sees of Antioch, of Rome, and the chief cities of the other provinces. From this it is evident, that no particular preference was yet given to the see of Rome. It is said, indeed, that particular honour should be given to the bishop of Jerusalem, saving the honour that is due to the metropolis. But by this was probably meant either Antioch, or Cæsarea, the metropolis of the province in which Jerusalem was.

With respect to the Novatians, it was agreed that, if they returned to the catholic church, the rank of their clergy should be preserved, provided
it

it did not interfere with that of the other clergy of the place ; so that a bishop was to become a presbyter, &c.

Among other incidents attending this celebrated council, Socrates gives an account of a conversation between the emperor and Acesius, a bishop of the Novatians who attended it, and for whom he had a particular respect. Being asked by the emperor whether he had any objection to the decrees of the council, he said he had none. Why then, said the emperor, do you separate yourself from the communion of your brethren ? To this the bishop replied by reciting the history of the persecution of Decius, at which time his sect commenced, and by observing that in their ideas, any sin committed after baptism was what the apostle John calls *the sin unto death*, and therefore that, though those persons who are guilty of such sins should be exhorted to repent of them, that they might obtain forgiveness of God, they ought not to be received into the communion of the church. On this the emperor pleasantly said, “ Erect a ladder then, Acesius, up to heaven, and mount it alone.”

At this time, though the Novatians had many churches in Asia Minor, and the neighbourhood of Constantinople, as well as in other places, and especially in Africa ; yet, as they were peaceably disposed, the emperor might not apprehend much inconvenience.

convenience from so small a breach in the unity of the church. Besides, his own mind must have been impressed with ideas very similar to those of the Novatians. For nothing else could lead a professed christian to defer baptism till near the hour of death, which, himself, and many others in that age, did*.

With respect to the followers of Paulus Samosatensis, it was ordained that, if they returned to the catholic church, they should be re-baptized; evidently because they did not baptize *in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, but generally *in the name of Christ* only, which was not deemed to be a valid baptism. These unitarians, no doubt, believed that much superstition was kept up by the usual form of baptism, and that it was not the original method of administering it by the apostles themselves.

The other canons of this celebrated council relate to inferior articles of discipline. When the whole was concluded, the members of it addressed a letter to the church of Alexandria, and to the churches of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, giving them an account of their determinations. In this they observed, that the first question related to the impiety and perverseness of Arius and his associates, and informed them that they had agreed that his impious and blasphemous opinion should be
anatha-

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 10, p. 35.

anathematized, that they had not even had patience to hear his impiety, madness, and blasphemy ; but that he had received the reward worthy of his wickedness, &c. alluding to his banishment. They then give an account of the principal of their other proceedings, and conclude with congratulating them on the extinction of heresy, and desiring their prayers for the permanence of their regulations*.

Constantine himself wrote three letters upon this occasion, one addressed to all the churches, acquainting them with the reasons of his calling the council, in which he says he had acted as one of their body, and their fellow servant, and that now there was no more room left for dissension, or controversy concerning the faith†. So little did this great man know of human nature, and so little could he see into futurity ! In the same letter he gives an account of the proceedings of the council with respect to the uniform celebration of the festival of Easter.

His second letter is addressed to the church of Alexandria, congratulating them on the removal of all error, and the restoration of unanimity in all the churches ; observing that he considered himself as one of them, and that he also had examined into the truth. He then mentions the impudent blasphemies of that impudent minister of the devil, and

* Socratis Hib Lib. i, Cap. 9. p. 26.

† Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. iii, Cap. 17, p. 586.

and enemy of the truth, Arius ; and says, that the decision of three hundred bishops, who had been assembled on this occasion, must be the decision of God himself. He concludes with exhorting them to return to the way of truth, and commends them to the divine keeping*.

The third letter is addressed to the bishops and people. It is full of the same invectives against Arius, treating him as another Porphyry, the declared enemy of christianity, and desiring that his followers might be called Porphyrians. He moreover orders that the writings of Arius should be burned, in order that no monument of them might be left to posterity, and declares that, if any person should find any book of Arius, and not immediately burn it, he should be put to death†. This is the first case of death being threatened by any christian magistrate for any thing relating to heresy ; and it is so manifestly absurd and extravagant, that surely it can be no recommendation of such unchristian conduct.

Before Constantine dismissed the fathers of this council, as twenty years of his reign were then just compleated, from the time that his father died, and the period was celebrated with much festivity in all the provinces, he invited all the bishops to
an

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 9, p. 30.

† Ibid. p, 21.

an entertainment in the palace, when some of them dined with the emperor himself, and others in rooms particularly prepared for them, so that nothing being wanting in point of respect and attention, it seemed to these good Fathers, being just emerged from persecution, to be, as our historian says, an image of the reign of Christ upon earth, and appeared more like a dream than a reality.

The emperor also made presents to each of the bishops according to their rank ; and when he took his leave of them, he addressed them in a speech in which he exhorted them to live in peace with one another, not to envy one another on account of any superior endowments which some of them might possess, and to forgive their mutual injuries, lest they should expose themselves to the ridicule of the heathens. He concluded with desiring their prayers for himself*.

Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. iii, Cap. 15. p. 585.

S E C.

SECTION VI.

*From the Council of Nice A. D. 325, to the Death
of Arius, A. D. 336.*

THOUGH this good emperor flattered himself that his great labour, address, and expence, on occasion of this celebrated council, had not been in vain, and had hoped that by means of it, an end would be put to all dissension in the christian world, he soon had reason to see, (whether he actually saw it or not) that neither kings nor councils are omnipotent, and that there is something in the mind of man that opposes itself to arbitrary authority, by whomsoever it is usurped. This appeared with respect to every article of consequence that had been decided by this council.

The Arians in Egypt were far from being pacified. It has indeed been seen, that they were treated with too much haughtiness and contempt to be disposed to conciliation, or submission. The emperor, provoked at this refractoriness, summoned some of them before him, to reprove them ; and what provoked him the more was, that Eusebius of

Nicomedia, and Theognis of Nice received those very Arians into their communion. A synod being held on the subject, these two bishops were deposed, and Constantine banished them into Gaul. This was within three months after the holding of the council, and they continued in this state of exile three years.

In order to justify his conduct, Constantine wrote to the church of Nicomedia, explaining the reasons of his proceeding, moreover accusing Eusebius of treasonable practices with respect to himself, and of favouring Arius in the council, which he says he had called in order to expel the mischief to which the madness of Arius had given rise. He concludes with advising the churches of Nicomedia and Nice to chuse good and orthodox bishops in the place of those who had been deposed*. From the tenor of this letter we may easily perceive what had been the state of free discussion in the preceding council.

As Eusebius was always considered as the head of the Arian party, it is not impossible that this circumstance, of his being supposed to have favoured the enemies of Constantine, might have great weight in his mind in taking so determined a part as he did against Arius. For neither long before, nor long after, the council, did Constantine appear to shew much zeal for the question in dispute.

His

* Theod. Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 20. p. 49.

His object was to reconcile the opposite parties, and by any means to preserve the peace of the church.

When Constantine acted with so high hand in procuring the condemnation of Arius and his doctrine, he little foresaw the change that would take place in his own mind with respect to them. The change, however, is remarkable, and historians account for it in the following manner. A presbyter, whose name does not appear, had the confidence of Constantia, the sister of the emperor, and who had been married to Licinius. By him she had been brought to think well of Arius and his friends, and upon her death-bed she earnestly recommended him to her brother, who had a great affection for her; and this presbyter persuaded the emperor that both the conduct and the faith of Arius had been much misrepresented by his enemies,

Upon this Constantine (supposed to be A. D. 330) sent for Arius from the place of his banishment, whither Euzoius, a deacon of the church of Alexandria, who had also been deposed by the bishop, had accompanied him*. After some conference, by which it is probable that the emperor was still more disposed to favour him, Arius presented a confession of his faith, in which he professed his belief that the Son was *begotten of the*

* Socratis Hist, Lib. i, Cap. 25, p. 60.

60 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VII.

the Father before all ages, and expressed his hope that, as this simple faith was the doctrine of the church, and agreeable to the scriptures, he might be re-admitted into communion without entering into matters of doubtful disputation*.

With this Constantine was satisfied. But not taking upon himself to do what belonged to the clergy, he sent him to a number of bishops, who were then assembled at Jerusalem, upon occasion of opening a new church there, desiring them to examine his faith, and if they had no objection to it, to receive him and Euzoius into communion with them. He also requested that they would inform the church of Alexandria, and all the churches of Egypt, Lybia, and Thebais, of their sentiments on his subject, and exhort them to give Arius and his friend a cordial reception among them†.

It is pretty evident from this transaction, that Constantine was now returned to the same state of mind in which he had been before the council; thinking that the question which had been agitated with so much warmth was of very little importance. His resentment was therefore now turned against those who had disturbed the peace of the church for such a trifle; and as Arius was willing to

* Socratis Sect. Hist. Lib. 26. p. 61.

† Ibid. Lib. ii, Cap. 27. p. 83.

to communicate with his adversaries, notwithstanding their differences of opinion, he thought that they acted a more unchristian part than he.

Before this time, viz. A. D. 348, Eusebius and Theognis, declaring that, having considered the import of the word *consubstantial*, they did not object to it, but to the *anathema* pronounced by the council (because, having known Arius very well, they were satisfied that he was not deserving of such a censure) they were recalled from banishment, and reinstated in their respective sees, which had been occupied by other persons; and Eusebius having great influence with the emperor, had no doubt used his good offices in favour of Arius. By his means; also, the Meletians were brought into favour with the emperor, and allowed to hold their separate congregations, in which they had been disturbed by the violence of Alexander bishop of Alexandria.

The Arians succeeded also in deposing a bishop who had been exceedingly hostile to them. viz. Eustathius, who had been removed from the see of Beræa, to that of Antioch, and who, at the council of Nice, had been so much the enemy of Arius, that he was by them charged with Sabellianism. On the other hand, he had accused Eusebius of Cæsarea with adulterating the Nicene creed. But Eusebius not only repelled the accusation, but charged his adversary with Sabellianism,

lianism, and many bishops wrote for and against him. He was himself a considerable writer, and is by Theodoret stiled *the Great*. What made him still more obnoxious to the friends of Arius, was his having refused to admit among his clergy several persons who were of that party, as Stephen, Leontius, Eudoxius, George, Theodosius, another Eustathius, whose names will occur in the subsequent history, and others, as they have been collected by Tillemont*.

At length a synod being called at Antioch (supposed by Dr. Lardner to be about A. D. 328) Eustathius was examined and deposed, as a person who was more of a Sabellian, than a believer in the Nicene creed; but according to other accounts, he was condemned for some immoralities that were laid to his charge. Asclepas of Gaza, was probably deposed at the same time, and it is generally thought on the same account. The decree of this synod was followed by great disturbances at Antioch, especially when they proceeded to chuse a new bishop; some being desirous of retaining Eustathius, and others of having Eusebius of Cæsarea. Eusebius, however, declined the invitation of the party which was for him, and the emperor himself wrote to the people of Antioch, exhorting them to peace, and approving the reasons which had been alleged by Eusebius for not chusing

* History of the Arians, Sect. 14.

choosing their see. At the same time he speaks of him as a person for whom he had the highest esteem, yea, as one who was worthy of the bishoprick of the whole world. The see continued vacant eight years*.

Constantine's letters to the people of Antioch, to Eusebius, and to the synod assembled on the occasion, are all preserved by Eusebius. They shew the greatest anxiety in this well meaning emperor about preserving the peace of the church, which had been much better secured by his not interfering in the business.

In the mean time Alexander bishop of Alexandria being dead. Athanasius had been chosen in his place; and not being disposed to adopt the sentiments of the emperor, or to pay any regard to the recommendation of the bishops assembled at Jerusalem (who had acted as the emperor wished them to do) refused to admit Arius into communion with his church, though the emperor threatened him with deposition and banishment. This obstinacy, together with some accusations, which Eusebius of Nicomedia, and other friends of Arius, had brought against him, induced Constantine to appoint a synod to hear him at Tyre, which was the more convenient, as it was in his way to Jerusalem, whither he was going to the consecration of a church which he
had

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 24, p. 58.

had built there ; and he hoped that when this affair was settled, he should enjoy the festival without alloy. This was A. D. 335.

Athanasius at first refused to obey the summons, but being threatened to be brought by force, he thought proper to comply. About sixty bishops attended this synod, and before them he was obliged to defend himself. One of the charges which had been brought against him was that he had cut off the hand of one Arsenius a bishop of the Meletians. But Arsenius being produced with both his hands, sufficiently proved his innocence. He was also charged with having whipped, or imprisoned, six other bishops of the Meletians*. Another accusation was that one Macarius, a person sent by him to expell Ischyra, who acted as a presbyter in the church of Marcotis, had by his orders rushed upon him in a violent manner, overturning the table in his church, breaking the chalice, and burning the sacred books. To this accusation Athanasius pleaded that he had no occasion to reply, because in the form of the indictment Ischyra was stated to be a presbyter, whereas it could not be proved that he was one. In this, however, he was over ruled, and the fact itself coming to be inquired into, it was thought proper to send a deputation to Marcotis to make the inquiry upon the spot. It consisted of Theognis of Nice,
Maris

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 25,

Maris of Chalcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Valens of Murfa, and Ursacius of Singidunum. But Athanasius suspecting some artifice, because Macarius was detained in bonds, and because they were his enemies who were gone to make the inquiry, withdrew himself. In the mean time, the persons who had been sent to Egypt returned with a confirmation of the charge; and the absconding of Athanasius being interpreted into a confession of his guilt, the synod pronounced the sentence of his deposition. But some of the bishops, and among them Marcellus of Ancyra, refused to subscribe the sentence.

After this the bishops who had composed this synod went to Jerusalem, to solemnize the dedication of the church, and there they received Arius into communion, as a person who had given the emperor satisfaction concerning his faith; and, in a letter to the church of Alexandria, alluding to the deposition of Athanasius, they added, that all ground of disunion was now removed*.

Athanasius, on the return of the emperor to Constantinople, had fled to him, who was much surprised and concerned to see him; but as he begged to have his cause examined in his presence, Constantine wrote to the bishops, who were still at Jerusalem, expressing his extreme chagrin, that while he was doing every thing in his power to

VOL. II.

I

promote

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i. Cap. 29, &c. p. 66, &c.

mote the cause of christianity, they should be quarrelling among themselves, and he desired them to come without delay to Constantinople. Accordingly some of them attended, viz. Eusebius of Nicodemia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, and other friends of Arius; and without repeating their former accusations, they now charged him, on the evidence of four bishops, with threatening to stop the usual exportation of corn from Egypt to Constantinople, which was then in distress for want of it. On this the emperor banished him to Triers in Gaul, not so much, it is said, because he believed the charge, as thinking thereby to preserve the peace of the church, Athanasius appearing the only obstacle to the restoration of Arius and his friends*. This was A. D. 336. He continued there, or in Italy, twelve or thirteen years†.

Anthony, the famous monk of Thebais, to whom Constantine, out of the great respect that he had for him, sometimes condescended to write, took the liberty, in return, of writing several letters to the emperor in favour of Athanasius, entreating him that he would not pay any regard to the representations of the Meletians, who had joined the party of Arius, and who were of course hostile to Athanasius. But it was without any effect. For
after

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i. Cap. 34, 35. p. 69, &c.

† Epiphani Hær. 68. Opera Vol. i. p. 725

after this, the emperor, writing to the people of Alexandria, reproached them for their folly and levity, and assured them that he should not change his opinion concerning Athanasius, or recall him from banishment, for that he considered him as a seditious person, and one who had been justly condemned by an ecclesiastical sentence.

To Anthony he replied, that he could not think lightly of the decree of the synod which had condemned Athanasius ; for though a few persons might be influenced by prejudice and pique, it was not credible that so many bishops, men of good character and moderation, as had concurred in this sentence, should have decided from such a principle. Athanasius, he said, was abusive and arrogant, the author of sedition and discord. However, notwithstanding Constantine's unconquerable aversion to Athanasius, he would not suffer the see of Alexandria to be filled by his rival John, who had succeeded Meletius, and whom the enemies of Athanasius would have put in his place, but sent him also into banishment*. This the emperor probably did, because his being appointed a bishop was in express contradiction to the decrees of the council of Nice, according to which Meletius himself, indeed, was to retain the title of *bishop*, but without the functions, and certainly without having any successor.

There

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 31. p. 89.

There was in this reign another synod, called for the purpose of deposing another bishop, of a character very different from that of Athanasius, though he had on some occasions taken his part. This was Marcellus of Ancyra. The offence that he had given to the Arians, whose party was now prevalent, was in his answer to a book written by Asterius, who had been a teacher of rhetoric in Cappadocia, and on becoming a christian, had written in defence of Arianism, and who was much caressed by the Arians. In his answer to him, Marcellus appeared to be not a proper substantialist, but an unitarian, such as Paulus Samosatensis had been, maintaining that Christ, in himself considered, was a mere man.

As Marcellus had attended the council of Nice, and had subscribed the Nicene creed, it is probable that other unitarians had done the same, on the same principle, whatever it was. He would never have been known to have been an unitarian, if he had not been a writer. This fact, however, sufficiently shews, that in this celebrated council the bishops were far from giving their real opinions, or at least from expressing them as they naturally would have done, if they had not been under some control.

It is said that, being threatened with deposition, Marcellus promised to burn his book, but that when the bishops met afterwards at Constantinople

tinople, A. D. 336, he refused to do it, and that then he was deposed. The business was wholly conducted by the Arians, and Basil an Arian was put in his place. The book of Marcellus is unfortunately lost, together with every thing else that was written in defence of unitarianism in all the early ages. But we have a large answer to it by Eusebius, of which are preserved many valuable extracts, in which I have availed myself in my *History of early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ*. In the next reign we shall see Marcellus come upon the stage once more, and recover his see*.

After this, in the thirty first year of his reign, Constantine, finding that Arius could not be received into the church of Alexandria without exciting dangerous tumults, he sent for him to Constantinople. But here also Alexander, the bishop of the place, refused to receive him into communion, notwithstanding all the pains that were taken by Eusebius of Nicodemia, and his friends for that purpose. The emperor, however, being no doubt satisfied both with respect to his faith, and his conduct (though Arius's adversaries say that he imposed upon the emperor) gave orders that he should be received the next day, it being then Saturday. But it happened, that as he was walking in the city, accompanied by his friends, he was suddenly seized with an occasion to ease himself

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i. Cap. 36. p. 72

himself, and being shewn to a necessity in the neighbourhood, he was found dead in it of a *prolapsus ani*, and what the Greek physicians called (*απεφθισμα.*)

This event was interpreted by the catholics as a just judgment of God upon Arius. It was moreover said by some to be in answer to the prayers of Alexander, who had shut himself up in the church, and begged of God that he would interpose, though it should be by his own death, to prevent his receiving Arius into communion.

Had Alexander himself died in the same manner, and not Arius, it would have been said to have been a still more exact answer to the same prayer; so ready are persons to imagine not only that *men*, but that *God* also, thinks just as they do, and enters into all their resentments*.

So much was Constantine changed before his death, that the Arians said (and though Sozomen says it was a lie, I cannot think it wholly improbable) that he intended to have called another council, in order to introduce the term (*ομοιουσι*) of *like substance*, for (*ομοουσι*) of *the same substance* into the creed, and that Constantius, who thought exactly as his father did at the time of his death,

in

* Socratis Hist. Lib. i. Cap. 87. p. 73. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 29. 30. p. 86, &c.

in calling the council of Ariminum did the very same thing that he had recommended to him*.

It is at least, highly probable, that whatever Constantine might really think of the person of Christ, he became dissatisfied, as many others were, with the term *consubstantial*, both on account of its being unscriptural, and of its implying not only an original, but a continued unity, such as the Sabellians had maintained. It is said that when Eusebius of Nicodemia was first accused to him of disapproving this term, the bishop shewed his garment, and with firmness replied, "If this garment should be torn into two pieces, could it be said that both the parts were *of the same substance*?" The emperor made no reply, but seemed much disturbed at it, finding himself disappointed in his expectations of putting an end to the discussion of all questions of this kind†.

This was before the banishment of Eusebius, and is said to have been the immediate cause of it. But as, when he recalled him, he admitted of his explanation of the term *consubstantial*, consistent with his own ideas, and Eusebius had his confidence afterwards, and till the time of his death, while all the consubstantialists were entirely out of favour, it is almost certain that, for some reason or other, he wished to have that word omitted in the

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 19. p. 124.

† Ibid. Lib. ii. Cap. 21. p. 32.

the creed, and that he would probably have changed that term (*ομοουσιον*) of the *same substance*, for (*ομοιουσιον*) of *like substance*, as less exceptionable, being a term that the consubstantialists themselves could not well object to, since what is of the *same substance* with another, must of course be *like* it. The great object of Constantine from the first was merely to preserve the unity of the church, and he probably never had much zeal for the question itself.

SECTION VII.

Of the Measures of Constantine to suppress Heresy.

IT is remarkable that none of the measures of Constantine to compose the troubles of the church, and to remove all dissention from it, had complete success, notwithstanding all the advantages of which he was possessed; having both general councils, and power on his side.

Even the difference of practice in the celebration of Easter continued after the council of Nice. The Audeans, a sect in Mesopotamia, so called from Audeus who was at the head of them, persisted in their former practice of celebrating Easter as they had always done, viz. at the time of
the

the Jewish passover. The writers who treat this Audeus as a sectary, give him the highest commendations for the strictness of his morals, and say that he was originally driven out of the church in consequence of the liberty that he took in reprov-
ing the irregularities of the bishops and clergy. On this they say that he formed a separate church, the members of which, the clergy as well as the laity, lived by the labour of their hands, and professed the most rigid morals. As they are said both to have celebrated Easter at the time of the Jewish passover, and also to have been Anthropomorphites, which many of the Jews are also said to have been, they were probably either Jewish christians, or, living as they did in their neighbourhood, very much influenced by them*.

The Audeans paying no regard to the decision of the council of Nice, which they thought to have been dictated by complaisance for the emperor, Audeus himself (who is allowed to have been a venerable old man) was sent for by Constantine ; but not being moved by any thing that was said to him, he was banished into Scythia, where he continued many years instructing the Goths in the christian religion ; and, as it is said, founding many monasteries. In this manner has persecution very often been the means, in the hands of

Vol. II.

K

divine

* Theodoret Hær. Fab. Lib. iv. Cap. 10. Opera Vol. iv. p. 241. Epiph. Hær. 70. Opera Vol. i. p. 811.

divine providence, of extending the knowledge of christianity. Both the Indians and the northern nations were in an eminent manner benefited both by Diocletian's persecution of Christians, and by Constantine's persecution of the Arians, and other heretics.

Even the order which had been established with respect to the rank and the prerogatives of the different sees in the council of Nice, did not prevent all disputes and disturbances on that subject. For there was a violent contention between Acacius, who succeeded Eusebius in the bishoprick of Cæsarea in Palestine, and Cyril bishop of Jerusalem, which Theodoret says was the cause of much mischief, and that, on some slight occasion, the latter was deposed and banished from Jerusalem by the former*. Cæsarea had, no doubt been the seat of the Roman governor; but the council had ordered that particular respect should be paid to the city of Jerusalem, and had not defined that respect with precision.

It seems extraordinary that any christians who had suffered so much, and so lately, by persecution themselves, should enter so warmly into the persecution of others. But this has been the case from the time of Constantine to the present day; and indeed was the same before that time, when the christians had any power. Constantine, who
had

* Theodoret Hær. Fab. Lib. ii. Cap. 26. p. 109.

had done so much for the church, seems to have thought that he had a right to regulate every thing relating to it ; and though he modestly enough said that the bishops were judges of things *within* the church, and that he was bishop only with respect to things *without it*, he must have thought himself qualified to decide who were the true and orthodox bishops, whose decrees he chose to enforce, as he so openly patronized some, and took their part so violently against others. And, what is more extraordinary, the right he assumed was not questioned.

As Constantine's laws respecting heresy have unfortunately served as a model to his successors, I shall give a particular account of them, by nearly translating what Eusebius has related concerning them ; and, it is remarkable, that he does it without the least censure, and indeed with evident approbation. By this means we shall have a view of the laws themselves, of the spirit by which they were drawn up, and also of that of the times in general.

The emperor, he says, having removed the dissensions among christians, and reduced the church of God to a perfect harmony, thought it his duty entirely to extinguish another race of atheistical men, as the deadly poison of mankind, who were laying waste whole cities, under the false appearance of modesty and gravity, but whom our Saviour
our

76 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VII.

our calls false prophets, and ravening wolves. Wherefore, having sent orders to the governors of provinces, he expelled and dispersed this race of men ; and besides that general law, he made a salutary provision with respect to the heretics by name, exhorting them to repent, and to come into the church. The following is his rescript for this purpose.

“ The emperor, Constantine, the great Augustus, to the heretics.

“ Know by this law, O ye Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, and Cataphrygians, who all of you make up your heresies for your peculiar congregations ; in what lies is your folly involved, and with what deadly poisons do your doctrines abound, so that the healthy are made sick, and the living are brought to everlasting death by your means ! O ye enemies of truth, adversaries of life, and counsellors of destruction, every thing with you is hostile to truth, and congenial to the most abominable wickedness, being full of absurdity and fiction, by which you fabricate your lies. You afflict the innocent, and withhold light from the believers : continually offending under the pretence of piety, you defile every thing. You wound the innocent and pure conscience with deadly blows. You in a manner deprive the eyes of men of day-light. What occasion is there to men-

SEC. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 77

“ mention particulars. For to treat properly of
“ your mischiefs would require much time, and is
“ inconsistent with my engagements. For so large
“ and immense is your wickedness, and so full of
“ all abominations, that a whole day would not
“ suffice to describe it. Besides, we ought to turn
“ away our ears from hearing such things, and our
“ eyes from seeing them, not to defile our own sin-
“ cere and pure faith with the particular enumera-
“ tion of them. Why then should we any lon-
“ ger bear such mischiefs ; especially since long
“ forbearance, as in a pestilential disorder, is a
“ means of infecting those who are well. Why
“ then should not I, as speedily as possible, cut up
“ by the roots, as we may say, so great wicked-
“ ness, by public animadversion ?

“ Wherefore, since it is not possible to bear
“ your most deadly and destructive tenets any lon-
“ ger, we declare by this law, that none of you pre-
“ sume to hold any public assembly for the future.
“ We have therefore given orders to demolish all
“ the places in which you hold your meetings.
“ We carry our provision so far, as to forbid such
“ assemblies of superstitious madness to be held
“ not only in a public place, but not even in a
“ private house. Wherefore, as is much more ho-
“ nourable you who wish for the true and pure
“ worship, come to the catholic church, and par-
“ take of its sanctity, by which you may come at
the

“ the truth. But let the deceit of your preverſe
 “ underſtanding be far removed from the happi-
 “ neſs of our times, I mean the accuſed and de-
 “ ſtructive madneſs of heretics and ſchilmatics.
 “ For it becomes me, on account of the happineſs
 “ which I derive from God, to provide that they
 “ who, paſs their lives in good hope may be
 “ brought from all error into the right way. from
 “ darkneſs to light, from folly to truth, from death
 “ to ſalvation.

“ Wherefore, to give neceſſary force to this
 “ law, I give orders, as was ſaid before, that all
 “ places of aſſembly for your ſuperſtition, I mean
 “ all houſes of prayer belonging to heretics, if
 “ they can be called houſes of prayer, be, without
 “ appeal, taken from them, and immediately given
 “ to the catholic church, and all other places to
 “ the public, and that no opportunity of meeting
 “ in them again be allowed ; that in no place,
 “ public or private, your unlawful aſſemblies may,
 “ from the preſent day be held*.”

In this manner, ſays our chriſtian hiſtorian,
 were the heterodox diſlodged from their lurking
 holes by the imperial orders, and the wild beaſts
 themſelves, the authors of the impiety, put to
 flight. Of thoſe who had been deceived by them,
 ſome, terrified by the imperial threats, diſſembled
 their ſentiments, and came to the church ; and

ſince

* Euseb, Vita Constant. Lib. iii. Cap. 63, &c. p. 620.

since the laws had provided that their books should be sought out, they who practised their forbidden arts were caught. On this account they did every thing in their power to provide for their safety by artifice, but others with great sincerity came over to a better hope. The bishops, making a distinction in these cases, removed those who acted hypocritically, as being only covered with sheep's cloathing, far from the sheep ; while after a sufficient trial, they received all the sincere converts into their churches. Thus, says he, they acted with respect to the infamous heretics. As to those who had nothing impious in their tenets, but had only been separated from the catholic church by factious persons (meaning the Novatians, Donatists, and Audeans) they received them without hesitation. These returning in crowds, as from a distance, found their proper home and country in the mother church, and as returning after a long time, they came back with joy. Thus, says he, were the members of the common body united together in perfect harmony, and the catholic church of God, being compacted within itself, shone with peculiar splendour, no heretical or schismatical congregation being left ; and that prince who alone was the care of God, was the sole author of this great and singular benefit*.

Thus

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. iii. Cap. 66. p. 622.

Thus, says Galgacus in Tacitus, speaking of the Romans, *Ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem vocant*, when they have laid all waste by war, they call it peace. Thus Nero, and Diocletian boasted of having exterminated the christians, and Lewis XIV, the Hugonots ; and the flattery and untruth were the same in all the cases. Happy is it for the world, that men who have no right to judge concerning truth, and who are wholly unqualified for the office, have it not in their power to establish what they hastily take to be the truth, let their intentions be ever so good. Human nature revolts against usurpation, as that must always be denominated which endeavours to establish any opinion by external force. And if Constantine, who could boast such singular merit with respect to the christian church, was not able, with his uncontrouled power, to establish an uniformity of opinion among his subjects, can we wonder at the ill success of those who have followed him in the same rash enterprize ?

All that power could do Constantine completely effected. The public creed was just what he chose it to be, and great numbers were made to refrain from writing or speaking against it ; but private opinion was not within his reach. So popular was Arius, and his opinions, at the time of the council of Nice, that there cannot be a doubt, but that if he and his friends had the same influence

SECT. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 81

ence with the emperor which those of the other party had got; an Arian creed would have been the standard of orthodoxy, and a *created logos* have been the shibboleth of the times. And had such men as Marcellus and Photinus been Constantine's instructors, the plain doctrine of the simple humanity of Christ, as a man approved of God, by signs and wonders which God wrought by him; and whom God raised from the dead (which was the creed of Peter and the other apostles) would have had the same advantage of being protected by imperial power; and the whole doctrine of Christ being the logos, created or uncreated, of his having existed before the creation of the world, and of his being the instrument of the creation, would, I doubt not, have been treated with ridicule, as the most absurd and unscriptural jargon.

But this pure christian doctrine was then, and always has been, saved from so great a disgrace. Truth does not stand in need of such foreign and heterogeneous supports. It disdains them, conscious of being able to do infinitely better without them. Civil power began at this time to do, and it has ever since continued to do, whatever it could to overthrow this *simple truth*. But it is founded upon a rock, and neither the power of man, nor the gates of death, can prevail against it.

In Constantine's law against the heretics, no mention is made of the Arians, and Sozomen says, it was because they were not then formed into separate societies, but held communion with the catholics. He also says that though the other sects suffered much in consequence of this law, the emperor relaxed of its rigour with respect to the Novatians, who were orthodox in their belief of the Trinity, and very numerous. And Acesius, a bishop of that sect at Constantinople, was much in favour with the emperor.*

S E C T I O N VIII.

Of the Circumstances attending the Death of Constantine, A. D. 337.

CONSTANTINE built a magnificent church in Constantinople, and dedicated it to the twelve apostles, with a view that when he was dead he might be interred within it, and enjoy the benefit of the prayers that would be put up in their honour, not doubting but that he should derive much

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 32. p. 90.

SEC. VIII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 83

much advantage from them. The good dispositions and intentions of this pious emperor, notwithstanding his mistaken policy, will, I doubt not, avail him more than his being buried in the church of the apostles, or than all the prayers that have been made in that place. This is an evident proof of its being the opinion of the times, that the dead might be benefited by the prayers of the living; and that all this should be gravely related by one of the most enlightened christian writers of that age, and without any censure, is the strongest proof of the great growth of superstition. But this will be still more evident from the last scenes of this emperor's life.

Not long after Constantine had accomplished his purpose with respect to the building of this church, and his own tomb in it, he was seized with a disorder which carried him off in the sixty-sixth year of his age, and in the thirty-first of his reign. He had just celebrated the festival of Easter with the greatest splendour, when he first complained of a slight indisposition; but his illness growing more serious, he had recourse to the hot baths of the city, and then to those of Helenopolis, a city so called from his mother Helen. This having no effect, and perceiving that he drew towards his end, he was determined to be baptized; firmly believing, as the historian says, that by virtue of the mysterious words of this institution, the offences
of

of his whole life would be expiated. Then, falling upon his knees, he confessed his sins, and begged pardon of God. Then also he first received the imposition of hands with solemn prayers ; that is, he then entered into the regular class of catechumens, which, according to the established rules of church discipline, preceded baptism.

After this he went to the suburbs of Nicomedia, and having assembled the bishops, he said that the time was then come, when, according to his most ardent wishes, and by means of their prayers, he hoped to secure his salvation. “ Now,” said he, “ is the time when we receive that sign which “ confers immortality. It was my intention to “ have been baptized where our Saviour himself was baptized, in the river Jordan. But “ God, who knows what is best for us, has determined otherwise ; and if the arbiter of life and “ death should prolong my life, and I be permitted to join your christian assemblies, and partake of your prayers, I promise to observe those “ rules of life which shall be worthy of God.”

When he had said this, he was baptized in the usual forms, was clothed with white garments, and reclined on a white bed. After his baptism (which he had, no doubt, deferred till this period from the superstitious idea of its efficacy to wash away sin, and of the impossibility of receiving so complete a purification more than once, or by any other means

SEC. VIII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 85

means) he would have nothing more to do with purple, but was always dressed in the white garment, which the superstition of the times had prescribed as the emblem of purity.

When he first put on this dress, he gave thanks to God with a loud voice, calling himself happy, as being then qualified for immortal life, and those miserable who were deprived of such a blessing. When his military officers lamented their condition, in being deprived of him, and wished him a longer life, he replied that he then only attained the true life, that he alone knew best what blessings he partook of, and that he did not wish to defer his departure to God any longer. All this was transacted in Pentecost, and on the last day of this festival, which was Monday, he expired A. D. 337*.

Eusebius describes at large the grief of all ranks of people at Constantinople, at Rome, and through the whole empire, upon the death of this extraordinary man, and also the ceremonies of his funeral, which was conducted by his second son Constantius. He had deposited his last will in the hands of that Arian presbyter whom his sister Constantia recommended to him, and who enjoyed his favour to the last; and this presbyter had delivered it to Constantius, who was nearest to him at the time of his death. He was buried as he wished to be, in the church of the twelve apostles.

Accord-

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. iv. Cap. 1. &c. p. 660, &c.

According to the common rules of estimating happiness, Constantine may be pronounced to have been one of the happiest of all his predecessors, from the time of the commencement of the Roman empire. He was never defeated in one of the many battles that he fought. He triumphed over all his rivals, and, except the feeble attempts of Licinius, enjoyed a long reign, uninterrupted by foreign wars, or internal rebellions, and of greater length than that of any of the emperors since Augustus. In short he succeeded in every thing, excepting one project, which to him could not well have appeared impracticable, viz. to put an end to all differences among a set of men whom he had rescued from a state of greivous persecution, and who, owing their safety to him, he might presume would out of gratitude, sacrifice to him, if not their private opinions, at least their animosities, and be contented to live easy and happy under him.

The purity of Constantine's intentions, and the sincerity of his piety, cannot be doubted ; and though he was superstitious, he was not more so than some of the wisest men of his time appear to have been ; every thing which wears that aspect about him being related not only without censure, but with entire approbation, by all the historians who have recorded them. Besides, why should we esteem christian superstition, in the case of

Con-

SEC. VIII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 87

Constantine, more reproachful than that of the heathen emperors, Trajan, Marcus Antoninus, and Julian, who are generally thought to have been great men notwithstanding ? They certainly were not destitute either of good sense, or strength of mind, with respect to the common conduct of life, or the affairs of the empire ; and if we judge by events, we must pronounce Constantine to have been as great a man as any of them.

So great was the piety of Constantine, that he converted his palace into a kind of church, by introducing a regular religious service into it*. He likewise prescribed a form of devotion for the army every Lord's day†. But his superstition appeared in ordering the sign of the cross to be put upon their shields. He ordered the Lord's day, and likewise Friday (the former being a festival, and the latter a fast among the more zealous christians) to be kept holy, by abstaining from labour‡. He had stated hours for his own private devotions. Easter he celebrated with peculiar solemnity, and on the preceding vigil the whole city was illuminated with columns of lamps, which gave a light almost approaching to day§.

It

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib iv. Cap. 17, p. 634.

† Ibid. Cap. 19, 20, p. 636.

‡ Ibid. Cap. 18. p. 635.

§ Ibid. Vita Constant Lib. iv. Cap, 22, p. 637.

It could not be supposed that Constantine should be exempt from the prejudice in favour of celibacy, which appears to have prevailed among all christians of his time. He shewed it by giving unmarried persons of both sexes, even when they were under age, the power of making a will, which was in favour of those who devoted themselves to a single life for the sake of religion*.

Great men have generally had great faults, and Constantine was certainly not free from them. If ambition be a crime, perhaps no conqueror or founder of a great family, can be said to have been innocent; and the desire of acquiring dominion is necessarily accompanied with jealousy in keeping possession of it; and in more cases than that of Constantine, this jealousy has been excited towards those who have had it most in their power to seize it, though they have been their sons or brothers.

Unfortunately, Constantine was led, probably by the insinuations, of artful and ill-designing persons, especially his wife Fausta, to see his son Crispus by a former wife in this dangerous light. He is said to have been an accomplished youth, and to have been greatly assisting to his father in his victories over Licinius, and on this account to have been very popular in the empire. The consequence, however, was the death of Crispus, and his

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 9, p. 21.

his friends, among whom was the son of Licinius by his sister. But we ought not to condemn Constantine till we have certain proofs of the innocence of Crispus ; and the subject is now covered with impenetrable darkness.

That Constantine was not so prone to jealousy and cruelty as many conquerors have been is evident from his brothers being not only permitted to live, but to enjoy the most honourable stations in the empire ; and the last fourteen years of his life, in which the government of the provinces was committed to those who were the next in order of succession to it, were passed without any symptoms of jealousy, and with the most entire and well placed confidence. The temper of Constantine was naturally so far from being cruel, that he was charged with the opposite extreme of too great indulgence to those who acted under him.

S E C T I O N IX.

Of Constantine's Conversion to Christianity.

AFTER having gone over the reigns of so many heathen and persecuting emperors, it is natural to enquire into the causes of Constantine's becoming a christian ; especially as the christianity of his successors, which gave an entire new turn to all the subsequent history of the Roman empire, and in a manner to that of the world, was, in a great measure the natural consequence of it. As we have no other account of this change than that which Eusebius has given us, as from the emperor himself, confirmed, as he says, by a solemn oath, I must lay it before my readers.

He told Eusebius, that after the death of his father, when he was marching against Maxentius being sensible that he stood in need of some assistance besides that which his troops could give him (especially as his adversaries had called to their assistance various magical arts and charms, which derived all their power from the heathen gods) and that the help which he wanted must come from some god or other, to whose providence arms
are

SEC. IX. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 91

are only subservient, he considered with himself the confidence and the faith of the several emperors who had preceded him, and compared them with those of his father. They had put their trust in a multitude of gods, whom they had endeavoured to render propitious to them by sacrifices and donations ; but though their oracles had promised them every thing, they had all come to an untimely end. On the other hand, his father alone, who had taken a different course, condemning their errors, and worshipping all his life no other than the one supreme God, as the guardian of his empire, had been remarkably successful. By this means, he said, that he had been led to give the preference to the God of his father, and to worship him only.

These reflections led him to pray to the God of his father, desiring that he would make himself known to him, and afford him aid in his present difficulties ; and while he was praying, which was towards the setting of the sun, but in clear day light, there appeared a luminous figure of a cross, fixed upon the sun, visible not only to himself, but to all the soldiers who were with him, with this inscription *τῷ ὧ νικᾷ* *By this conquer*. Being astonished at this extraordinary appearance, and not knowing what to make of it, the night following Christ appeared to him in a dream, with the very
same

same sign which he had seen in the heavens, ordering him to make a military standard like it, and assuring him that it would be his security in his battles.

Early in the morning he called his friends together, and informed them of the prodigy; and having assembled his jewellers, he described to them the form of the standard, and ordered them to execute it in gold and precious stones; which they accordingly did. Eusebius says that he had seen it, and he gives a very particular description of it. He says that the emperor always used it in battle, and that he had others made like it, and carried at the head of all his armies.

Being then determined to worship no other God besides him who had appeared to him, he sent for those who were the best acquainted with the mysteries of his religion, to ask them what God it could be, and what was the sign that he had seen. They told him that the God he had seen was the only begotten son of the one true God, and that the figure was the symbol of immortality, and the trophy of the victory which, while he was on earth, he had gained over death. At the same time they explained to him the cause of his coming, and the reason of his incarnation. He heard them with pleasure; and comparing their discourse with what he had seen, he was satisfied that it was by the interposition of God himself that he had been led to

to this knowledge. From this time he applied himself to the study of the scriptures, he made the priests of that God his associates, and thought he ought to worship no other than the God whom he had seen. Therefore, confiding in him, he prepared to encounter the tyrant Maxentius*. On this extraordinary narrative I shall take the liberty to make a few observations.

1. It is in the highest degree improbable that the founder of so peaceable a religion as the christian, who solemnly declared that his kingdom was *not of this world*, and who expressly forbade his servants to fight for him, should in this manner put himself at the head of an army, and like Mahomet, establish his religion by the sword.

2. It is little less improbable, that when christianity had been so long preached in the world, and when the natural means of conversion were abundantly sufficient, Christ should interpose in person, as in the case of the Apostle Paul to convert Constantine or any other particular man.

3. If it be true, as Constantine here says, that his father had been all his life a worshipper of the true God (by which he certainly meant the God of the christians) it is very extraordinary that he should not have brought up his son a christian, or at least have given him more knowledge of christianity than he professes to have had at the
time

* Euseb. Vita Constant. Lib. i, Cap. 28, &c. p. 515, &c

time of this appearance. Besides, independently of any instructions he might have received from his father, or mother, it is not to be supposed that Constantine could have lived to the age of thirty (in the latter part of which the christians had been so violently persecuted, that they and their principles must have been the subjects of general conversation) and yet have known so little of christianity as this story supposes. According to it, he did not even know the meaning of the sign of the cross, and had no assistance whatsoever except from his own reflections.

4. There is manifestly an inconsistency in the story in this very respect, as it represents Constantine sending for the priests of the God that he had seen in his vision, which implies that he knew what God it was, and then asking them who he was, and what was the meaning of the figure of the cross as if he had never seen it before. Had he really been in the circumstances that he describes, viz. wholly ignorant of this strange God, and this symbol, he would naturally have made a proclamation to assemble the priests and ministers of all religions, without distinction, and not those of any one in particular.

5. It is something extraordinary that the priests whom he did send for, should be such bishops, or presbyters, as held the same opinions concerning Christ that Eusebius himself professed, considering
Christ

Christ as a *God*, who had become *incarnate*, and that the whole of the subsequent history, which represents Constantine as fighting and triumphing under the conduct of this incarnate God, should give so much countenance to the doctrine of the Nicene creed.

6. We have no account of this appearance, any more than of the vision, except from Constantine ; though others are said to have seen this figure in the heavens, as well as himself. We have therefore the evidence of not more than one person, for this extraordinary fact, and that of an emperor, whom few would chuse to contradict, so far as to say they were present, and saw no such thing ; so that the evidence when properly examined, cannot be said to be very strong. Though, therefore, we may not be able to discover where the fallacy lies ; whether the emperor really imagined that he saw such a figure in the sky, and had the dream in consequence of it, or whether he and his christian friends, seeing nothing more than a natural parhelion (which sometimes does exhibit the appearance of a cross) and then fancying they saw the inscription also, purposely made the most of it, in order to encourage the soldiers (who, having served under his father, were probably in a great measure christians) the story is far from being intitled to credit.

Upon

Upon the whole, it appears to me most probable, that Constantine and his friends saw a natural parhelion, and that all the other circumstances were either imagined, or invented; and that the story has lost nothing in passing through the hands of Eusebius. I am unwilling to think that the whole was an absolute invention of the emperor, though I should be disposed to admit *this* rather than the truth of two miracles, for which there is so little evidence, and that of the most suspicious nature, and also which is attended with so many improbable, and inconsistent circumstances, as I have pointed out.

That Constantine was prone to superstition, has been sufficiently evident from the account of the last scenes of his life. I am therefore the more willing to suppose that he was always so much inclined to it, as involuntarily to magnify a natural appearance into a prodigy, which is far from being uncommon, than that he purposely invented the whole for any purpose of ambition. When he was emperor we do not find that he had recourse to artifice to gain any point. On the contrary, he made too much use of power. Some address he avows with respect to his project for composing differences among christians. But this was chiefly good temper, forbearance, and complaisance, and nothing that could be called imposition

tion, or deceit; and in this business also the engine that he made the most use of was power.

Mr. Gibbon, whose hatred of christianity gives a tinge to his whole history (and this, like any other strong and unreasonable prejudice, has often misled him, and made him ascribe events to the most improbable causes) supposes that Constantine might be led to embrace christianity by the disposition to passive obedience in christians.

“ The passive and unresisting obedience, “ he says*, “ which bows under the yoke of authority, “ and even of oppression, must have appeared, “ in the eyes of an absolute monarch, the most “ conspicuous and useful of the evāgelic virtues. “ The primitive christians derived the institution “ of civil government, not from the consent of the “ people, but from the decrees of heaven. The “ reigning emperor though he had usurped the “ sceptre by treason and murder, immediately “ assumed the sacred character of viceroy of the “ deity. To the deity alone he was accountable “ for the abuse of his power, and his subjects were “ indissolubly bound by their oath of fidelity to a “ tyrant who had violated every law of nature or “ society. The humble christians were sent into “ the world as sheep among wolves; and since “ they were not permitted to employ force, even “ in the defence of their religion, they would be

VOL. II.

N

“ still

* Vol. ii. p 187.

“ still more criminal if they should be tempted to
 “ shed the blood of their fellow creatures in disput-
 “ ing the vain privileges, or the sordid possessions
 “ of this transitory life.”

This is only a specimen of that malicious sarcasm, unworthy of every thing that bears the name of *history*, and highly unbecoming the dignity of it, with which this *impartial historian*, as he would be called, ever treats christianity, and it prevented his seeing that, by putting himself at the head of a small number of passive and unwarlike people, Constantine had but little chance of getting the better of the great majority, who were obstinate and warlike. With the views that Mr. Gibbon ascribes to Constantine, he would more naturally have thought, that if he could recommend himself to those subjects of the empire who alone were formidable, he did not need to give himself any uneasiness about the rest, since they were ready to submit to any master whom God should send them. How does this conduct of Constantine suit with that profound policy which Mr. Gibbon elsewhere ascribes to him, and how could he expect “ to infuse his own intrepid spirit,” which he says* he did, into such troops as these tame and spiritless christians could furnish him with ?

Besides, what would it have availed Constantine to have the favour of such tame subjects as
 Mr.

Mr. Gibbon represents the christians to have been, who were as ready to attach themselves to any other, even a professed enemy of their religion, as to him. For according to Mr. Gibbon, all sovereigns, being equally sent of God, would have been equally acceptable to them. In these circumstances how can we admit with Mr. Gibbon*, that "the piercing eye of ambition and avarice soon discovered to Constantine that the profession of christianity might contribute to the interest of the present, as well as of the future life." This historian will hardly admit that at the accession of Constantine, christianity had so far established itself, by its own evidence, as to have been embraced by a majority of the subjects of the Roman empire. For this, surely, would be to admit the truth of it; and unbelievers in general are willing to ascribe its establishment to the power of Constantine exerted in its favour; and the immediately preceding persecution by Diocletian shewed that, with respect to power, and no doubt wealth also, the christians were greatly inferior to the pagans. In these circumstances Constantine's eye of ambition and avarice must have been a good deal clouded to see any prospect of success in his contest for the empire by the aid of christianity. Or, if his eyes were clear, those of Julian must have been very dull, to attempt the subversion of

* Page 208.

of christianity, when the professors of it were, no doubt, much more numerous than they were at the accession of Constantine, and when it had had the advantage of a long establishment in its favour.

With such prejudices as Mr. Gibbon every where discovers, it was impossible for him to perceive the true spirit of christianity, or the nature and value of the character which it forms. Else he would not have concluded, that because men may magnanimously suffer for their religion, and would bear any torture rather than deny or disguise their real belief (which Mr. Gibbon makes no scruple of doing, by outwardly professing that religion which he at the same time cannot forbear treating with contempt) they would tamely abandon their civil rights. Let him shew that, by becoming a *christian*, a person gives up any of his rights *as a man*, or that he will have less public spirit, and act with less zeal in the defence of his own rights, and those of others. Rather, as the christian does not value life as such, it may be concluded that he will be more ready to sacrifice it in the cause of his country and of mankind. Mr. Gibbon will hardly say that the Jews were forbidden the use of arms, and christians worship the same God that they did.

It cannot affect the evidence of christianity to suppose that the foundation of civil government had

Sec. IX. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 101

had never been at all considered by Christ or the apostles, and consequently that they never had any opinion on the subject. They certainly do not say that a right to power is *not* derived from the consent of the people. And finding themselves under a government which it was not in their power to change, it was very natural, and right, in them to exhort their followers to submit to it, as to the situation in which it had pleased divine providence to place them.

What Mr. Gibbon says of Constantine's conversion to christianity being promoted by the murder of his son, is almost too contemptible to be mentioned, as it shews the most violent and malignant prejudice. "At the time of the death of Crispus," he says*, "the emperor could no longer hesitate in the choice of a religion. He could no longer be ignorant that the church was possessed of an infallible remedy, though he chose to defer the application of it till the approach of death had removed the temptation and danger of a relapse." This is to insinuate that christianity encourages crimes by providing an expiation for them, and that a man is more disposed to become a christian in consequence of having committed them, whether he have had any proper evidence of its truth or not.

If

If Constantine had no previous belief of a future state, and of the punishments which christianity denounces against all sinners, what occasion could he think he had of a pardon of sin? Were Nero, Domitian, or Commodus the more inclined to christianity in consequence of the many murders they committed, or Maxentius, Galerius, and others who had imbrued their hands in the innocent blood of christians in his own time? Will Mr. Gibbon himself, labouring under any mortal disease, take the prescription of a quack, merely because he promises him a cure.

This remark of Mr. Gibbon's agrees with what he says of one of his *secondary causes* of the spread of christianity, viz. that it held out to mankind the happiness of a future state. But certainly there must be some other foundation of faith, besides a mere *promise*. The heathen religion promised all temporal prosperity to the worshippers of the Gods, and it is well known that the happiness of this world has as powerful attractions with respect to the bulk of mankind as that of another. But those promises did not secure the perpetuity of those religions. In time men saw no ground of faith in them, and they deserted them for a religion that held out to them nothing but sufferings and death in this world, with well grounded hopes of recompence in another. As to Constantine, there can be no doubt but that he was as sincere a christian

tian before the death of Crispus, as he was after that event, and Mr. Gibbon only mentions the circumstance for the sake of the opportunity it gave him to throw out a sneer against christianity.

The *writers* that properly fall within this short period are so few, that I shall reserve an account of them to the conclusion of the next ; and indeed from this time I shall not think it necessary to notice more than the principal of them in any period, and that in the shortest manner.

PERIOD

P E R I O D VIII.

FROM THE DEATH OF CONSTANTINE A. D. 337,
TO THAT OF CONSTANTIUS, A. D. 361.

S E C T I O N I.

*General Observations on the State of Things in
this Reign.*

CONSTANTINE had three sons, and by his last will he divided his empire among them, in the following manner : To Constantine, the eldest, he gave Britain, Gaul, Spain, and the proconsular part of Africa. To Constantius, the second son, he gave Egypt, and all the eastern part of the empire, with Thrace, and of course Constantinople ; and to Constans, the youngest, he gave Italy, Greece, Macedonia, and Illyricum. He also left a brother of the name of Julius, and two nephews by another brother, and to these certain provinces had been assigned. But the army declared they would not obey any other than the sons of Constantine, and put them to death ; some say with the consent of Constantius,
or

his friends, among whom was the son of Licinius by his sister. But we ought not to condemn Constantine till we have certain proofs of the innocence of Crispus ; and the subject is now covered with impenetrable darkness.

That Constantine was not so prone to jealousy and cruelty as many conquerors have been is evident from his brothers being not only permitted to live, but to enjoy the most honourable stations in the empire ; and the last fourteen years of his life, in which the government of the provinces was committed to those who were the next in order of succession to it, were passed without any symptoms of jealousy, and with the most entire and well placed confidence. The temper of Constantine was naturally so far from being cruel, that he was charged with the opposite extreme of too great indulgence to those who acted under him.

their father, the object of which was to restrain the idolatry of the heathens. They ordered all the heathen temples to be shut up, both in the city and the country, and converted the materials of them into christian churches. For, like their father, they distinguished themselves by repairing old churches, and building new and magnificent ones. Of this number was the church at Emesa, which was famous for its beauty.

In the same spirit of zeal with that of their father, but which our more liberal ideas must condemn, they forbade Jews to purchase slaves from any sect besides their own, under the penalty of such slaves becoming the property of the treasury ; and they made it confiscation of goods, and even death, for a Jew to circumcise any slave. The object of this law was, that all the heathens who changed their religion might become christians. For at that time, our historian says, no converts were made to christianity, except from them.*

Indeed, we cannot wonder that a total stop should be put to the conversion of the Jews, when christians began to consider Christ as a god, and thereby to infringe upon the doctrine which, from long before the time of our Saviour, and in every period since, they have justly held to be most sacred, viz. *the Unity of God*. To establish this doctrine, and to teach it to the whole world was one great

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 17. p. 122.

great object of the Jewish religion, and of all the privileges of their nation. They therefore justly consider all trinitarian christians as idolaters, and with peculiar aversion, as being more inexcusable than the heathens themselves.

There cannot be a stronger argument against the interference of civil power in matters of religion than the history of Constantine and his sons, the first of the princes of this world who took christianity under their protection. Constantine was, by his own confession, very imperfectly instructed in the principles of christianity when he undertook this new and arduous office. He first got himself instructed by some particular bishops ; and presently after patronizing the party of his instructors, he procured the condemnation of every sect that was hostile to them, and enforced their decisions which in effect he himself dictated, by rigorous civil punishments. It was not long, however, before he saw reason to change his opinion, or at least his conduct. Before he died he was entirely reconciled to Arius and his friends, to whom he had been most violently hostile ; and he entered into their measures as readily, and as warmly, as he had done into those of their enemies.

His eldest son Constantine, and his youngest Constans, retained the first opinion of their father with respect to the person of Christ ; and in their dominions, viz. in the West, the Trinitarian doctrine

trine was supported. But Constantius embracing what was then called the Arian doctrine, such Arianism was in his reign the orthodoxy of the East, and the majority of the bishops were too ready then, as they have been ever since, to change with the court. Such a bias has interest on the minds of men, christians, and christian clergy, not excepted. But that the standard of faith should be fixed by the caprice (for all history shews that it deserves no better name) of men who, in general, give but little attention to the subject of religion, and who, if they should do it, are commonly the least able to judge concerning it, (in consequence of their minds being occupied with other things, and especially on account of the temptation they are under to make religion a mere engine of civil policy) is peculiarly reproachful to christians and christian clergy, who ought to call no man master upon earth, and much less those who ought rather to be their disciples.

It would not be half so preposterous in princes and statesmen to establish a system of *medicine* within their dominions, and to oblige all their subjects to submit to be treated as physicians of their appointment should direct, as to establish a system of *theology*, and enforce a conformity to it by temporal rewards and punishments. It might even be said, that the health of their subjects is an affair of a civil nature, in which the civil magistrate is deeply

SAC. I. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. [109]

deeply interested, and that therefore it becomes him to make such provision for it as to his wisdom should seem best. But if, notwithstanding this pretence, all men are allowed to provide for the health of their bodies in whatever manner they please, or to neglect it altogether if they think proper, much less pretence is there to prescribe to men in what relates to the health of their minds, and their happiness in a state to which the power of civil magistrates does not extend, and where, without having any advantage over the meanest of their subjects, they themselves must *receive according to their works*; and when the part they shall have acted towards their fellow christians and fellow men, will not be overlooked.

In any other view than this' above mentioned, the ecclesiastical history of the reign of Constantius is as uninstruative. as it is unpleasant and tiresome; as it consists of little besides a struggle between the Nicene and the Antinicine bishops, or the Arian and Athanasian parties, as they may be properly termed in this reign, in which Athanasius himself, and his adventures, make a great figure. Many were the councils which we shall be obliged to attend on both sides*, but
councils

The number of councils held in this reign is pleasantly ridiculed by Ammianus Marcellinus a heathen historian. Speaking of Constantus he says (in Mr. Gib-

THE HISTORY OF THE P. R. VIII.

councils in which nothing materially new was decided ; so that at the close of this reign the doctrine of the trinity stood very nearly as it had done before the council of Nice ; since all who called themselves orthodox, or catholic, maintained that Christ, or the logos, was the uncreated attribute of the Father, but inferior to him ; only *God of God*, and *light of light*, not *αὐτοθεός*, or *God of himself*. A real advance, however was made towards the close of this reign, in the system of Arianism.

SEC-

bin's translation, Vol. II. p. 266) “ The christian religion, which in itself is plain and simple, he confounded by the dotage of superstition. Instead of reconciling the parties by the weight of his authority, he cherished and propagated by verbal disputes, the differences which his vain curiosity had excited. The highways were covered with troops of bishops galloping from every side to the assemblies which they call *synods* ; and while they laboured to reduce the whole sect to their peculiar opinions, the public establishment of the posts was almost ruined by their hasty and repeated journies.” I see nothing, however, in the original which implies that Constantius might have reconciled the parties by the weight of his authority or that the differences among the bishops were excited by his vain curiosity. The imperial authority would have availed nothing in this case ; nor were the differences of opinion at all excited by his curiosity, but by other causes.

SECTION II.

*From the beginning of the Reign of Constantius
A. D. 337, to the Council of Sardica, A. D.
347.*

PRESENTLY after the death of Constantine, his son of the same name sent Athanasius from Treves the place of his banishment where he had frequent interviews with him, to his see at Alexandria, Constantius under whose government Egypt was, making no opposition to it, though the measure gave great offence to Eusebius of Nicomedia, and all the Arians, who complained of it as an irregular proceeding, since he was not reinstated in the same manner in which he had been deposed, viz. by a council. It is said, however that he was received with great joy by the people of his diocese.* At the same time also, and by the same power, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepas of Gaza, were sent to their respective sees, though they did not obtain possession of them till some time afterwards,

About this time died Eusebius the historian, bishop of Cæsarea, and was succeeded by Acacius, who will make a considerable figure in the transactions

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 3. p. 81.

tions of this reign ; and not long after, viz. A. D. 340, Constantine, invading the territories of his brother Constans, was killed in battle near Aquileia, in the third year of his reign. Being the elder of his father's sons, he thought this division of the empire too small, and had claimed all Africa and Italy.

After the death of Alexander bishop of Constantinople, which was at the age of ninety eight years, Paul was chosen in his place, to the great displeasure of the Arians, who would have raised Macedonius to that dignity. This, however, being done in the absence of Constantius, he caused him to be removed, and put Eusebius of Nicomedia in his place*.

This proceeding being contrary to the canons, a council was held immediately after at Alexandria, by the friends of Athanasius and Alexander, consisting of about an hundred bishops of Egypt, Thebais, Lybia, and Pentapolis, who took advantage of it to criminate Eusebius, as the persecutor of Athanasius, whom they, in their letters to the bishops, justify from the accusations which had been brought against him†.

These proceedings, in Egypt, where Athanasius had no doubt many friends, did not deter Eusebius and his party from engaging in other measures

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 6, 7. p, 83, 84.

† Athanasii Apologia II. Opera. Vol. 1. p. 720

fores against him in a council held at Antioch, five years after the death of Constantine, A. D. 341, in which Flaccillus bishop of that city presided. But neither Maximus bishop of Jerusalem, nor Julius bishop of Rome were there, though Socrates says that the ecclesiastical canons forbade any thing to be done in the church without the consent of the bishop of Rome. However, he could only mean that it had not been reckoned decent to determine any thing of consequence without the concurrence of so eminent a bishop as that of Rome, any more than without the concurrence of the bishop of Antioch, of Constantinople, or of Alexandria. For there was no decree of any council in favour of the bishop of Rome in particular.

This council was dignified by the presence of Constantius himself, who, wishing to attend the dedication of a new church in Antioch, which in the life time of his father he had superintended, thought it a convenient opportunity of calling this council*. Accordingly ninety-seven bishops were assembled, and in it the friends of Eusebius accused Athanasius of resuming his see without the decree of any council, of exciting a sedition upon his return, in which many persons had died, and of beating some with his own hands, &c. They

VOL. II.

P

more-

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 5. p. 97.

moreover brought up again what they had before laid to his charge in the council of Tyre.*

Having agreed on the deposition of Athanasius, the bishops at Antioch appointed Gregory to succeed him, after the see had been refused by Eusebius of Emesa†, on account of the affection which he knew the church of Alexandria bore to Athanasius.

Indeed, nothing could be more unjust, or more contrary to ancient usage, than thus obtruding upon a diocese a bishop who was not of their own choosing. But when it came to be a matter of importance to the state who should be possessed of any ecclesiastical dignity, the civil powers, on some pretence or other, claimed the nomination, and these bishops acted, no doubt, by the direction of the emperor, who was in this case guided by them. Indeed, arbitrary princes are generally the tools of others, who are abler than themselves, and who have got the ascendancy over them.

In

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 8. p. 84.

† The history of this Eusebius is pretty remarkable, and is thus given by Socrates, from an account of George bishop of Laodicea, who wrote his life. He was a native of Edessa, and was very early instructed in the knowledge of the scriptures, but he afterwards studied them more accurately under Eusebius of Cesarea and Patrophilus of Scythopolis. Coming to Antioch about the time that Eustathius was deposed (on the accusation of Cyrus of Berea for holding the doctrine of

In this council it was agreed that no bishop deposed by any council should be restored except by another council, consisting of at least an equal number of bishops. Even the catholic bishops afterwards pleaded the authority of this council in their proceedings against Chrysoftom, as we shall see in its proper place.

After dispatching the affairs of Athanasius, the bishops who were assembled at Antioch proceeded to fix a creed, which they prefaced by saying that they did not receive it from Arius, but from their ancestors. In this creed it is declared, that there is *one God, and one only begotten Son of God,*
who

Sabellius) he continued to live with Euphronius who succeeded him. It being then proposed to advance him to the rank of presbyter, he avoided it by going to Alexandria, where he studied philosophy ; and it was, after his return from that city to Antioch, that, becoming intimate with Flaccillus who succeeded Euphronius, he had this appointment to the see of Alexandria. Not chusing to go thither, he went to Emesa, but being insulted at his ordination, as a person who was addicted to the Mathematics, by which was meant magic, he fled to George bishop of Laodicea, who afterwards wrote his life. By his means, and the efforts of Flaccillus and Narcissus, he was at length settled at Emesa. Notwithstanding he subscribed to the decree at Antioch, he was accused of Sabellianism ; but Constantius, having an esteem for him, took him with him when he went against the Barbarians. Lib. ii. Cap. 9. p. 86.

who existed before all ages, and remained with the Father who begat him, and that by him all things visible and invisible were made. By these few articles, they probably hoped to heal, or compromise, all their differences, as it is expressed in such a manner as that neither the friends of Arius, nor the advocates for the Nicene creed, could object to it.

But, apprehensive perhaps that this would not be thought to come sufficiently near to the Nicene creed, the members of this council agreed upon another, which was said to have been the composition of Lucian of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia, a circumstance which, it might be thought, would recommend it to general acceptance*. In this creed Christ is said to be *God of God, perfect out of perfect, the living word, wisdom, life, the true light, not liable to change, the express image of his Father's divinity, substance, power, &c. the first born of every creature, who was in the beginning with God.* This comes much nearer to the Nicene creed, and is apparently more remote from Arianism, but still consistent with it, since the phrase (*ἐκ θεου*) of God, may not necessarily mean *from his substance.* Perhaps to appear farther removed from Arianism, the bishops who composed this council pronounced an anathema against those who said that the *Son of God is a creature*

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 5. p. 98.

creature, like one of the creatures. But the original Arians always made a great difference between Christ the being by whom all other things were made, and the *creatures* which were made by him; he being made by God himself, and other things not by God immediately, but by him.

Gregory above mentioned, being present, subscribed this creed as bishop of Alexandria,* and after the synod he was conducted by a guard of five thousand soldiers, who were joined by the Arians of the city; but in the tumult one of the churches was set on fire and burned down. On this arrival of Gregory, Athanasius made his escape, undiscovered, and fled to Rome. But Eusebius and his friends, confiding in the goodness of their cause, wrote to Julius, the bishop of Rome, requesting that he would himself hear and decide the affair of Athanasius†. In the mean time the Arians at Alexandria, not being satisfied with Gregory, in part on account of the burning of the church, and also because they did not think him sufficiently zealous in their interest, made choice of George of Cappadocia, one of the most distinguished Arians of that age, whose untimely end I shall have occasion to speak of under the reign of Julian.‡

Eusebius

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 10, p. 86.

† Ibid. Lib. ii, Cap. 11, p. 89.

‡ Ibid. Lib. ii, Cap. 14. p. 92.

218 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VIII.

Eusebius did not live to see the issue of this affair of Athanasius. He died presently after this council of Antioch, and in his place the people chose Paul a second time ; but the Arian party ordained Macedonius in another church of the city. Constantius, who was then at Antioch, hearing of this, sent Hermogenes with a military force to expel Paul. But in this he was so violently opposed by the people, that in a tumult they burned his house, and killed him, by dragging him through the streets by his feet. This happened A. D. 342.

On this the emperor himself went to Constantinople, expelled Paul, and punished the citizens by lessening their allowance of corn. He did not, however, think proper at that time to confirm the election of Macedonius, but suffered him to officiate in the church in which he had been ordained. Upon the death of Eusebius, who had been at the head of what was called the Arian party, the most active supporters of it were Theognis of Nice, Maris of Calcedon, Theodorus of Heraclea in Thrace, Ursacius of Singidunum in Upper Mœsia and Valens of Murica in Upper Pannonia.

At this time the church and court of Rome were the refuge of all the bishops who had suffered by the Arians, and indeed of those who thought themselves injured in any other respect. Not only had Athanasius fled thither, but also Paul of Constantinople,

Constantinople, Asclepas of Gaza, Marcelles of Ancyra, and Lucius of Adrianople. All these Julius sent back to their proper sees, with letters of acquittal and recommendation, from a synod which he had called upon the occasion. But the Eastern bishops were much offended at this interference of Julius, and in a synod assembled at Antioch, A. D. 345, they wrote to reprove him for meddling in their affairs; alleging that they had not interfered when Novatus was condemned at Rome. And neither Marcellus nor Asclepas was actually restored till after the council of Sardica; nor was Athanasius re-established till five or six years after this time, though it might seem from Socrates* that he was then restored, though with much tumult and bloodshed. But in this he refers to another restoration.

Constantius was no more pleased with the interference of the bishops of Rome and his synod in the affairs of the East, than were the bishops who met at Antioch; and hearing that Paul had recovered the see of Constantinople by that means, he sent Philip the Præfect of the Prætorium, with orders to depose him, and to give the see to Macedonius, which till this time he had forbore to do. Accordingly, Philip, fearing a tumult contrived to get Paul into his power by stratagem, and then sent him to the place of his nativity at Thessalonica.

* Lib. ii, Cap. 13. p. 97,

ca. Still, however, the business was but half done, and so great was the opposition of the people, or, at least so great was the crowd that was assembled upon the occasion, and which either would not, or could not, disperse, that the soldiers fell upon them, and more than three thousand were killed, either by them, or by their treading upon one another.

About this time, according to Socrates, Constantius dedicated the celebrated church of St. Sophia in Constantinople, the architecture of which is admired to this day.* Philostorgius says that when Constantius built this church, he removed into it the relics of the apostle Andrew, and those of Luke the evangelist, from Achaia, and also those of Timothy from Ephesus†. From this time this species of superstition was so common, that particular instances of it will not deserve to be mentioned. In a later period, no church, or altar was thought to be duly consecrated unless it contained some relics.

The

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 16. p. 94.

\ Cadrenus says that this edifice having fallen down, was rebuilt, and dedicated a second time by Constantius, Valesius's note. But it is perhaps more probable that Socrates is mistaken in placing the *dedication* of this church at this time, if indeed he meant so much, for he only says that he then *built it* (ἐκτίθει).

† Lib. iii, Cap. 2. p. 486.

The emperor Constant, finding that the council which Julius had called at Rome had produced no effect, and that neither Athanasius nor Paul were reinstated in their sees, owing to the opposition of his brother, requested that three bishops might be sent to him to confer upon the subject. Accordingly Narcissus of Cilicia, Theognis of Nice, Maris of Chalcedon, and also Mark of Syria, were dispatched from the East for that purpose. But refusing to confer with Athanasius, and presenting a confession of faith different (though in no material respect) from that which had been drawn up at Antioch, they were dismissed without effecting any thing.

At this time we find the first mention of Photinus as bishop of Sirmium. He had been the disciple of Marcellus of Ancyra, and from him the Unitarians were for a long time called *Photinians*.*

My reader will imagine that we have already had creeds enough in the life of one emperor; but they are not one half of those that were the produce of this reign. In the year 344 or 345, there was another council at Antioch, consisting of almost all the bishops of the East, on what occasion convened, does not appear; but in it they drew up another creed, longer than any of the preceding, and sent it to the bishops in the West. It is by

no means Arian, and differs in nothing from the Nicene creed, except in its not containing the word *consubstantial*. It not only speaks of Christ as *God of God* and *light of light*, but anathematizes those who say that *the Son was produced from any other substance than God*, or that *there was any time in which he did not exist*; and that it cannot be said without danger of error, that the son was *made out of nothing*; since this is not said of him in the scriptures; but it condemns those who say that the Father did not beget the son *of his own will and pleasure*. At the same time the bishops of this council execrate and anathematise those who say “that Christ is a mere man, like Paul of Samosata, and the followers of Marcellus and Photinus, who deny the eternal essence and divinity of Christ, and his perpetual and immortal kingdom, in order to establish a monarchy.” They also condemn the Sabellians and Patripassians by name.

If we consider the tenor of this creed, and the solemn declaration with which it concludes,* it will appear to be drawn up by the bishops of the East, in order to give all possible satisfaction to their brethren in the West, and to heal all the past breaches in the church; and the seeming tautology of it probably arose from their desire to prevent all

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 19, p. 92.

all cavilling, as if it had not expressed their real sentiments. It also furnishes a proof that the generality of the Eastern bishops did not entirely adopt the doctrine of Arius, though they disapproved of the measures of his adversaries, and could not relish the term *consubstantial*, as both unscriptural and expressly reprobated by the council which condemned Paul of Samosata.

Notwithstanding the peaceable and friendly disposition of these Eastern bishops, those in the West were not disposed to receive their overtures with equal good temper. They being assembled at Milan, A. D. 346, refused to give any opinion about the creed, alleging its being drawn up in Greek, which they did not well understand, that the Nicene creed was sufficient, and that all subtle explanations ought to be avoided. And since neither Paul of Constantinople, nor Athanasius, had been able to recover their sees, notwithstanding the letters of the emperor Constantine in their favour, they requested that another general council might be held, in which that affair should be finally decided, and another formulary of faith drawn up, which should be agreed upon by all; alleging that the deposition of these bishops had no other cause than an attempt to unsettle the faith that had been agreed upon at Nice. Accordingly, both the emperors, wishing, no doubt, to compose all differences,

differences, agreed to call another council at Sardica in Illyricum, on the borders of both their dominions, for the eleventh year after the decease of Constantine, viz. A. D. 347.*

SECTION III.

From the Council of Sardica, A. D. 347, to the Death of the Emperor Constans A. D. 350.

WHEN the time that had been fixed was come, there were assembled at Sardica about three hundred of the Western bishops, but only seventy six of the Eastern, and among them Ischyra bishop of Mareotis, appointed by those who had deposed Athanasius. Some of the Eastern bishops alleged their bad health, and others the shortness of the time; for which they blamed Julius bishop of Rome, though six months intervened between the calling and the holding of it. The true reason probably was, their being well apprised that the Western bishops came with a determination to reverse all their proceedings at Antioch, and that they would hear no reason to the contrary; which

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 20, p. 103.

which soon appeared to be the case. For when they were all assembled, the Western bishops insisted upon Paul and Athanasius (and no doubt the other bishops also whose causes were to be decided) having a seat in the council. But to this the Eastern bishops objected, that this would be to make them judges in their own causes, and that they would be obliged to acknowledge that they had done wrong in deposing them, without having an opportunity of hearing any reason for changing their opinion.

These objections not being admitted by Hosius of Corduba, and Protogenes of Sardica, who of course presided, the Eastern bishops, after much fruitless negociation, left them, and formed a separate council at Philippopolis in Thrace. There they confirmed their former decrees against Athanasius, Paul, Marcellus, and Asclepas. They also pronounced sentence of deposition against Julius bishop of Rome, and Hosius of Corduba, for communicating with them; and against Maximinus, bishop of Treves, not only for communicating with Paul, but for refusing to do it with some bishops of the East. They also deposed Protogenes bishop of Sardica, and Gaudentius; the former for acquitting Marcellus whom they had condemned, and the latter for having opposed Cyriacus his predecessor, and for having favoured those

those who had been deposed by them. Having made these decrees, they, according to custom, wrote to the distant churches, warning them not to receive into their communion those whom they had deposed, or to communicate with them by letters.

They then drew up a creed in which Socrates says they reprobated the word *consubstantial*. Sozomen, however, says that they only made no mention of it, but anathematized those who said there were *three gods*, that Christ was not God, or the same with the Father, Son and Spirit, and the Son was unbegotten, or that there was a time when he was not.

This creed is in fact a condemnation of the Unitarians, and a confirmation of what they had agreed upon at Antioch ; which, as I have observed, was of a conciliatory nature. By condemning those who held that there are *three gods*, it is possible that they alluded to the doctrine of the perfect *equality* of the Son to the Father, which was contended for, and acquired the seal of orthodoxy, in a later period, but had probably been only just advanced, and had given offence, at this time. Socrates also says (according to the present copies) that these Eastern bishops confirmed the use of the term *αὐομοιότης*, i. e. asserted that the son was *unlike* the Father ; but from their subsequent conduct, it is

is probable that they did the very reverse of this, agreeing with what was done by the Western bishops at Sardica*.

The Western bishops, assembling without the Eastern, first condemned them for their desertion of the council, and then pronounced sentence of deposition against those who had deposed Athanasius, viz. Theognis of Nice, Narcissus of Irenopolis, Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine, Menophantus of Ephesus, Ursacius of Singidunum, Valens of Murcia, and George of Laodicea.†

Having dispatched this business, the bishops assembled upon this occasion confirmed the Nicene creed, with an express approbation of the phrase (*ὁμοουσιος*) of the same substance and an express condemnation of the phrase (*ὁμοιουσιος*) of like substance, which then began to be contended for by the Arianizin, or more moderate party, and they sent letters to the absent bishops containing copies of their resolutions, and appealing to them to judge between them and the Eastern bishops. At this council Marcellus of Ancyra was restored to his see on pleading that his book had been misunderstood,

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 20. p. 104. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 11. p. 107.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 21. p. 108.

stood, and that he did not hold the opinions of Paul of Samosata*.

Thus ended the council of Sardica, from which so much had been expected. Instead of uniting the Eastern and Western bishops, it occasioned a greater separation between them, the former being probably offended that the latter did not receive their creed, or shew so good a disposition towards a reconciliation as themselves had discovered. Constantius, however was so much intent upon the restoration of Paul and Athanasius, whose sees were within the dominion of his brother (who had opposed their restoration before, and who was not likely to consent to it now) that he absolutely threatened him with war in case of his non-compliance†.

Upon this Constantius consulted with his bishops, and they advised him, for the sake of peace, to comply with his brother's demands. Accordingly he not only consented, but wrote himself to Athanasius, encouraging him to come to him, and assuring him of his readiness to give him the possession of his see. The bishop appearing to distrust him, the emperor wrote two other letters. After this, carrying with him a letter from Julius, written in the highest style of encomium, to recommend

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 20. p. 103.

† Ibid. Cap. 23. p. 108.

mend him to the people of Alexandria, he waited upon Constantius, who received him very graciously, but would have stipulated with him for a church within his diocese for the use of the Arians. To this Athanasius seemed to make no objection, provided that a similar demand of his brother might be granted, viz. that, in every place in which the Arians being established, there should be a separate place of assembly for those of his persuasion. But the Arians being consulted, said that it would be inconvenient. Constantius then made no farther opposition ; and not only consented to the restoration of Athanasius, but wrote letters to the people in his favour.. At the same time he restored Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra, Asclepas of Gaza, and Lucius of Adrianople agreeably to the decrees of the council of Sardica*.

It might have been expected that, after so much condescension on the part of the emperor, in whose territories he was to reside, Athanasius would have proceeded immediately to Alexandria, and have taken quiet possession of his see. But instead of this, he went to Jerusalem, where he persuaded Maximus the bishop to call a council of the bishops of Syria and Palestine, in which he was again restored to his see, and received into the communion of the church. From this council letters were sent to Alexandria, and to all the bishops

of Syria and Egypt, to acquaint them with the resolutions of it. This proceeding of Maximus exposed him to the ridicule of the Arians, as he was one of those who had consented to the expulsion of Athanasius in the former council.

After this Athanasius pursued his journey to Alexandria, admonishing the people in all the cities through which he passed to avoid the Arians, and to receive into their communion none but those who would admit the term *consubstantial*. This conduct gave his adversaries a fresh handle against him, and especially his attempting to make ordinations in other dioceses*. Thus, however, at length was Athanasius reinstated in his see, A. D. 349. It was immediately after this, as Le Sueur supposes, that he called the council of one hundred bishops of Egypt, Thebais, Lybia, and Pentapolis, in which his innocence was again confirmed, and from which letters were addressed to all the Eastern churches, as was mentioned before.

Ursacius and Valens, seeing Athanasius established in his see, deserted the party of the Arians, acknowledging their error to Julius bishop of Rome, and subscribing to the term *consubstantial*. They also wrote to Athanasius, professing their readiness to hold communion with him for the future†.

The

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 24. p, 116.

† Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 12. 13. p. 90. Cap. 24. p; 116.

The great supporter of the catholic cause, and of Athanasius as at the head of it, was the emperor Constans; but he giving himself up to pleasure, and suffering every abuse of government, such as selling the public employments, &c. and pleasing neither the people nor the army, one of his officers, Magnentius, was encouraged to revolt against him; when Constans, being unprepared for the contest, fled, and being pursued to a town near the Pyrennees, was put to death. The only thing for which he is praised by the orthodox, is the support that he gave to their cause; and for this one virtue Athanasius speaks of him as a martyr*.

S E C.

Mr. Gibbon thinks the account of this recantation of Ursacius and Valens very improbable. “ Their epistles, to Julius bishop of Rome, and to Athanasius himself,” he says, “ are so different from each other, that they cannot both be genuine. The one speaks the language of criminals who confess their guilt and infamy, the other of enemies who solicit on equal terms an honourable reconciliation. Hist. Vol. ii, p. 278. Note. Indeed, it cannot be supposed that these two bishops should have been so much respected by their party as they were after such conduct as is ascribed to them. They took the lead at the council of Ariminum, and in every thing relating to the Arians.

* Apcl. 1, Opera, Vol. i. p. 678:

SECTION IV.

From the Death of Constans, A. D. 350, to that of Gallus, A. D. 354, including the Council of Sirmium against Photinus.

CONSTANTIUS being freed from the Persian war, in which he had not been successful, by an invasion of Persia by the Massagetæ, found himself at liberty to revenge the death of his brother; and this he did in a war of three years continuance, defeating Magnentius first in Pannonia, and then in Gaul, so that at length he was reduced to the necessity of putting an end to his own life, A. D. 353. We see in a strong light the power of the bishops of the principal sees at this time, by Magnentius sending ambassadors to Athanasius bishop of Alexandria, and by Constantius, his professed enemy thinking it worth his while to write to him, with professions of friendship and regard on this occasion*.

Valens bishop of Mursa, is said to have ingratiated himself with Constantius by his management at

* Athanasii ad vitam solitariam agentes epistola, Opera. Vol. i, p. 825. Ad Constantium Apologia, Vol. i, p. 677.

at the battle of Murfa. For while the emperor was at his devotions in the church, during the engagement, the bishop was assiduous in bringing him news of all the particulars of it, and gave him the first account of the enemy being put to flight. It is added to the account, but probably by the enemies of Valens and the Arians, that when he was asked what authority he had for the news, he replied that an angel had brought him the intelligence*. But before this was accomplished, several events took place in the ecclesiastical world.

Being now sole emperor, and under no restraint from the influence of a colleague, Constantius presently took occasion to reverse what he had been in a manner compelled to do by his brother. He first banished Paul from Constantinople; and according to Socrates, he was put to death at Cucusus in Armenia, by those who were conducting him to Cappadocia, the place of his exile; but Sozomen says he could not tell whether he might not die of a disease. Marcellus was banished from Ancyra, and his see restored to Basil. Lucius bishop of Adrianople was put into prison, and died there, and the emperor was so provoked by his past conduct, and also by some recent accusations of Athanasius, especially on account of his presuming

* Sulp. Severus, Lib. iii, Cap. 38. p. 266.

caped when his life was aimed at, the writers of the account (which was drawn up by order of the church) could not tell*. Getting by some means out of danger, he concealed himself six years in the deserts of Thebais, till the death of Constantius. There, however, he was not idle, but continued to write and publish several books ; and thence it is

“desert his episcopal station, till he had dismissed in
 “safety the last of the congregation. These minute
 “circumstances,” he adds in a Note, “are curious, as
 “they are literally transcribed from the protest which
 “was publicly presented three days afterwards by the
 “catholics of Alexandria.” I have, however, carefully
 perused this account, and find not one of the circum-
 stances mentioned in this Note. Some of them, how-
 ever, are contained in Athanasius’s own account of his
 flight in his *Apology to the Emperor*, Opera Vol. i.
 p. 217. According to that the psalm recited was one
 which celebrates the mercy of God, as *enduring for e-*
ver, in the margin called Psalm 105th, or our 106th, and
 he only waited until the *greater part* of the congrega-
 tion were dispersed. Had he staid till the *last*, as Mr.
 Gibbon represents him to have done, he could not pos-
 sibly have escaped. Mr. Gibbon, probably made use of
 Fleury, who refers both to the account drawn up by
 our church, and to that of Athanasius himself, and it is
 the latter, not quoted by Mr. Gibbon, that contains the
 particulars which he has embellished.

* Athanasii Opera, Vol. i, p. 866, &c.

is thought that he occasionally made excursions, even as far as Italy, without ever being discovered by his enemies.

Macedonius having succeeded Paul at Constantinople, greatly promoted a violent persecution which the emperor now carried on against the Consubstantialists, first banishing all the bishops who professed that faith, and putting others in their places ; and then compelling the people by confiscation, exile, and, it is said, even torture, to communicate with them. But the churches of Achaia, Illyricum, and Macedonia were not molested*. I would observe, however, that no instances are mentioned of this general and heinous accusation.

While these things were transacting in the East, Constantius was conducting the war against Magnentius in the West. Being at Sirmium after the defeat of Vetrano, (who had also declared himself emperor) A. D, 351, he convened a council for the purpose of deposing Photinus, whom the decrees of two former councils had not been able to silence, on account of the great affection which his people had for him. To this council there came from the East George of Alexandria, and Basil of Ancyra, and from the West Hosius of Corduba, but against his will. They soon agreed to depose Photinus, as holding the doctrine of Sabellius and

VOL. II.

S

of

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 27. p. 120.

of Paul of Samosata. This says, our historian, was universally thought to be well done ; but what they did afterwards had not the approbation of all*.

Having dispatched the business of Photinus, the bishops who were assembled on this occasion sat down, as was usual in the councils of this reign, to compose a creed, and not contenting themselves with one, they drew up two, one in Greek, composed by Mark of Arethusa, and the other in Latin. In the Greek creed Christ is called *God of God, and light of light*, and it anathematized those who taught that the Son was *made out of nothing, or of any other substance than that of the Father*, or who say that *there ever was a time in which he did not exist*. This is sufficiently agreeable to the doctrine of the Nicene creed.

With respect to Photinus, and the philosophical Unitarians, it equally condemns those who say that the substance of God could be dilated or contracted, and that this dilated substance was the Son ; and those who assert that what was born of Mary was a mere man. At the same time they declare, that the Son is not equal to the Father, but subject to him ; and they anathematize those who say that the Son was begotten without the Father's will. They add several propositions relating

* Socratis Hist. Vol. i, Chap. 29. p. 123.

ing to the Holy Spirit, by which it appears that different opinions had begun to be advanced on that subject: but they are chiefly levelled against the philosophical Unitarians.

The Latin creed condemns the word *consubstantial* as unscriptural, and an attempt to explain what is above the human capacity. In other respects it does not differ from the preceding, except in words, and in being much shorter though, like the former, it contains much reasoning.

From the tenor of these creeds, and all those which have hitherto come before us in the course of this reign, it is highly probable that Eusebius of Nicomedia, and the other friends of Arius, did not entirely adopt his opinions (if indeed he himself adhered strictly to what he first gave out) though they thought him right in some things, and were persuaded that his enemies erred also, and especially in carrying their animosity against him much farther than the importance of the subject required. Since all these creeds insist particularly on there being no time in which the Son was not, as well as on his being formed of no other substance than that of the Father, I think it probable that by this time there was such a change in the sentiments of those who came to be deemed the orthodox party, as that they no longer supposed that the act which was called the *generation of the Son*

Son took place a little before the creation, but in a proper sense of the term, *from all eternity*.

Photinus being promised a restoration to his bishoprick provided he would subscribe to these creeds, not only refused to do it, but challenged any of the bishops who were present to dispute with him publicly on the subject. Accordingly Basil of Ancyra accepting his challenge, a time was fixed by the emperor when himself and many persons of senatorial rank, as well as the Fathers of the council, would be present, and notaries were provided to write what should be advanced on both sides. After a very eager debate, our historian says, that Photinus was vanquished and condemned. It is evident, however, that Photinus himself was of a different opinion. For it is added that, in his banishment he wrote books both in the Latin and Greek languages, especially against all heresies, making no account of any opinions besides his own*.

Notwithstanding these Fathers had tendered the Latin creed as well as the Greek one, to Photinus, on second thoughts they were not themselves pleased with it, thinking it not quite consistent with itself; and they took pains to call in all the copies of it that were gone abroad, the emperor himself threat-

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 30. p. 124. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 6. p. 135.

threatening to punish any person who should conceal it: But it was already in too many hands for such an order to have any effect*.

The venerable Hosius, who as I have observed, was present at this council, had some time before been banished from his see by the Arian party, and was now brought by the emperor to Sirmium against his will. As he refused at first to subscribe the creed, our historian says he was compelled to do it by blows and torture†. But Sulpicius Severus says he was thought to be a favourer of the Arian party in Spain; but this was attributed to the weakness of age, as he was more than a hundred years old‡. It is perhaps more probable that he rather favoured the Unitarians.

Julius bishop of Rome, the steady friend of Athanasius dying about this time, was succeeded by Liberius, and as the Arians a little before the death of Julius had written to him, desiring his communion, and a farther hearing of their charge against Athanasius, Liberius thought it right to take it up, and therefore cited him to appear at Rome, and, on his refusal, excommunicated him. After this he sought the friendship of Athanasius, and holding another synod, in which he examined the
accusa-

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 30. p. 124. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iv, Cap, 6. p. 185.

† Ibid. Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 31. p. 130.

‡ Lib. ii. Cap. 40, p. 266.

accusations and defences of Athanasius, he received him into his communion ; but not to irritate Constantius, he sent a deputation, to intreat him to convoke a general council of the whole empire, to put an end to the differences of the church*.

Constantius at first called a Synod at Arles, A. D. 353, where Saturnius the bishop (called by Salpicius Severus†, a violent and factious man) was a great promoter of the Arian cause, and being greatly irritated against Athanasius, partly for the reasons mentioned before, and partly because he was said to have taken the part of Magnentius, he procured him to be condemned again ; but Paulinus of Treves, refusing to confer with his brethren, was banished to Phrygia‡.

Gallus, whom Constantius had made Cæsar and to whom he had given the command of the armies in the East while he went on the expedition against Magnentius in the West, defeated the Jews who had revolted at Diocæsarea in Palestine, and totally destroyed the place. But being accused of endeavouring to make himself independent, Constantius sent for him, and caused him to be
put

* Hillarii fragmenta Opera, p. 450, 488.

† Lib. ii. Cap. 40. p. 266.

‡ Ibid Lib. ii. Cap. 39. p. 261.

put to death. The next year he made Julian his brother Cæsar, and sent him to take the command in Gaul*.

SECTION V.

From the death of Gallus A. D. 354 to the Council of Ariminum A. D. 359, including the rise of the ANOMOEANS, or those who, after Aetius maintained that the Son was of a Substance unlike that of the Father.

ABOUT this time an advance was made in the doctrine of Arius. It was indeed a natural consequence of what he had maintained, but was not actually drawn by him. He had said that the son was made *out of nothing*, and that therefore he ought to be called a *creature*; but still, as he was the maker of all other creatures, he thought him to be of a nature quite different from them, and similar to that of the Divine Being, though not the same with it; and therefore his friends would gladly have substituted the term *ομοιουσι* of like substance for *ομοουσι* of the same substance.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 33, 34. p, 131,

substance. But though the proper consequence of Arius's doctrine was, that since Christ was a mere creature, he could not differ materially from other creatures, and consequently must be of a nature unlike that of the supreme and self-existent Being; no person appears to have perceived, or at least have had the courage to avow this consequence before Aetius, who was followed by Eunomius, whose disciples were often called Anomœans, from their maintaining that Christ was of a nature different from that of God (*ανωμοι*).

Aetius was a native of Antioch originally, as some say a physician, but certainly a man of excellent understanding, great acuteness, and well skilled in logic, as well as acquainted with other branches of science. Because he disputed with subtilty concerning the nature of God, his enemies reproached him with the name of *Atheist*. He was much noticed by Gallus, who was fond of the society of men of learning and religion; and Philostorgius says that he often sent him to his brother Julian (though he must be mistaken when he adds *in Gaul*) to recall him from heathenism, to which he was addicted.

Aetius's thirst for knowledge led him to go to Alexandria, where he made himself master of the philosophy of Aristotle. On his return to his native city he was ordained deacon by Leontius, who

who was then the bishop. Here Actius not only appeared to have adopted the opinions of Arius, but became an open and strenuous defender of them; and thinking that Arius and his friends in general temporized, in order to please the emperor, he even separated himself from their society (though some say that he was excommunicated) avowing his opinion that Christ was not only not of the same nature with the Father, but of a different nature, and unlike to him. His zeal and ability were so great, that he soon made many disciples at Antioch.

Eudoxius, who succeeded Leontius in that see, imbibed his doctrine, as well as Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine, and Uranius of Tyre. George of Laodicea, in a letter written at the suggestion of some persons whom Eudoxius had expelled, and addressed to a number of bishops who were assembled at Ancyra at the dedication of a church which Basil had built in that city, represents almost the whole city of Antioch as infected by the heresy of Actius.

These bishops, being alarmed, formed themselves into a synod, in which they drew up a very long account of their faith, with much reasoning on the subject, and in which they are very careful to distinguish between *the Son* and *a Creature*. This creed, as it may be called, is preserved by

Epiphanius*, together with a letter of Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea, written to oppose the *new heresy*, as they call it, of Aetius†. If what Philostorgius says be true, of Basil having been desirous of the see of Antioch before Eudoxius was placed in it, it will in some measure account for the opposition there was between these two prelates‡.

Taking the affair into farther consideration, they applied to the emperor to see that what had been decreed at Sardica and Sirmium (where it had been determined that the Son was *like* the Father) should be carried into execution. The persons sent on this embassy were Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebastia, Eleusius of Cyzicum, and Leontius, a presbyter who had an office near the emperor's person. On their arrival they found Asphalius a presbyter of Antioch, a zealous friend of Aetius, who having procured letters from the emperor in his favour was about to return. But Constantius being informed of his heresy, and that of Eudoxius, by these ambassadors, sent an answer to the bishops assembled at Ancyra, in which he assured them that he was far from being disposed to favour Eudoxius or Aetius, whom he considered

28

* Har. 73. Opera, Vol. I. p. 846, &c.

† Ibid. 73, Opera. Vol. I, p. 852.

‡ Lib. iv, Cap. 6, p. 504.

as one whose study it was to deceive the ignorant multitude.

He desired them to recollect the discourse he had had with them, in which it was proved to their mutual satisfaction, that the Son, with respect to his substance, was *like* the Father. For the present, he says it may suffice to excommunicate them, but he threatens his farther vengeance if they did not refrain from their madness. He then proceeds in a strain of furious invective against the disciples of Aetius; and the historian ascribes it to the emperors interference that their heresy did not prevail at this time*. Thus we see Constantius taking as decided a part in favour of the *Homoiousians* and against the *Anomæans* (for so the disciples of Aetius were called) as his Father had done in favour of the *Consubstantialists*, or the *Homoousians*, as they are sometimes termed.

Constantius having pacified the troubles of the empire, and being arrived at Milan. A. D. 355, which was thirty years after the council of Nice, in compliance with a very earnest request from the bishops summoned a general council to meet him there. Accordingly some few bishops from the East, but more than three hundred from the West, were assembled. But the Eastern bishops insisting on the perpetual banishment of Athanasius, and
others

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 13, 14. p. 146. &c.

others as violently opposing it, the council broke up without effecting any thing*.

Upon this occasion the emperor acted in a very arbitrary manner, banishing all the bishops who would not comply with his will. At this time, however, Liberius, bishop of Rome, shewed great firmness. For in a conference which he had with Constantius, he refused to consent to the condemnation of Athanasius, without a farther hearing of him before his accusers. The emperor banished him to Berea in Thracæ; he, with a degree of spirit which approached to insolence, refused a handsome allowance which was offered him for his maintenance; telling the officer that the emperor wanted all his money to pay his soldiers, &c.†

Hosius, bishop of Corduba, was another object of resentment to the Arians, as well as Athanasius, because he prevented the bishops of Spain from joining them against him. At their instigation the emperor sent for him, and not being able, either by promises or threatening, to make any impression upon him, he kept him from his see till the council of Sirmium. The principal of the other bishops who were banished upon this occasion, were Eusebius of Vercell, and Lucifer of Cagliari.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 36, p. 134.

† Theodoret Lib. ii, Cap 16 p. 92.

liari in Sardinia, both of whom were sent to Thebais in Egypt; and Hilary of Poitiers who was sent into Phrygia: Dionysius, bishop of Milan, would have consented to the condemnation of Athanasius, provided the articles of faith proposed to them had given him satisfaction; but he, as well as the people of his see in general, rejecting a creed sent from the emperor by Ursacius and Valens, he also was banished, and Auxentius, an Arian, was put in his place*. During these transactions Athanasius continued in the deserts of Egypt, and thence he wrote an apology to Constantius, but without any effect.

After residing a long time at Milan, Constantius came to Rome, which he had never seen before, and with which he was greatly delighted; and there, with great pomp, but too much ostentation, he celebrated the twentieth year of his reign. At this time the senators, who had been applied to, declining the office, a number of respectable women petitioned the emperor for the return of Liberius; and he consented, upon condition that he would enter into his views with respect to Athanasius; and that Felix who had been appointed to succeed him, might be continued to discharge the episcopal functions jointly with him. But because Felix, though a consubstantialist himself, ad-

mitted

* Sulp. Severus, Lib. ii, Cap. 39. p. 263.

mitted those of the other party to communion with him, the orthodox would not so much as enter the church while he was in it ; and the populace being very clamorous on the occasion, and frequently crying *one God, one Christ, one bishop*, nothing was effected at that time.

Constantius, having remained a month at Rome, returned to Milan, and afterwards went to Sirmium where the bishops of his party being assembled, drew up another creed, supposed to have been the composition of Potamius, bishop of Lisbon. In this it is expressly said, that no mention should be made of the term *consubstantial*, and the Father is declared to be without dispute greater than the Son, who is however stiled *God of God*, and *Light of Light**.

Hosius, who was at this time an hundred years old, was compelled, and it is said by torture, to subscribe this creed ; though Hilary says it was composed by him and Potamius together. Philistorgius says that he subscribed both the creed and the condemnation of Athanasius ; but Athanasius himself says that he subscribed the former, but not the latter. On his compliance, however, the emperor gave him his liberty ; and returning to Spain he died not long after protesting, it is said,

* Hilary de Synodis, p. 357.

SECT. V. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 181

said, against the violence which had been offered to him.

Liberius, who had now been absent from his see two years, wrote to the emperor by Fortunatian, to solicit his restoration. He likewise wrote to Vincent of Capua, to intercede for him ; and in a letter to the Eastern bishops, he acknowledged the justice of their proceedings against Athanasius, and apologized for his own acquittal of him, which he says, was only in consequence of his having been received into communion by his predecessor Julius. The year following, having subscribed the creed of Sirmium, and the condemnation of Athanasius, he was permitted to return to Rome ; where, notwithstanding his abject conduct, and his having subscribed an heterodox creed, he was received with great joy ; and Felix retiring of his own accord, he took quiet possession of his see*.

S E C-

* Theodoret. Lib. ii, Cap. 17. p. 95.

S E C T I O N - VI.

Of the Councils of Ariminum and Seleucia,
A. D. 359.

AS but few of the Eastern bishops had attended these councils in the West, and it was manifestly inconvenient for them so to do; and as, for the same reasons, the Western bishops could not be expected to attend in the East, the emperor, in calling another general council, appointed the Western bishops to meet at Ariminum, and those of the East at Nicomedia; intending to have it considered that all these bishops, though meeting in different places, composed but one council. But in this scheme the emperor was again disappointed. For the two assemblies did not agree, nor did those who met at Ariminum agree among themselves; and those who met in the East differed still more.

At Ariminum about four hundred bishops were assembled, and Taurus, the præfect, had orders not to permit them to depart till they had agreed in a confession of faith; the emperor promising him, as Sulpicius Severus adds, the consulship in case he succeeded in this. Orders were given,
on

on this as on other similar occasions, that all expences attending the travelling of the bishops, should be defrayed out of the public taxes; but the bishops of Gaul and Britain generously refused this allowance, except three of the latter, who being poor could not afford it*,

The Athanasians took possession of the church, and the Arians who did not amount to more than eighty, met in a separate place. Among these Ursacius and Valens took the lead, and they proposed to both parties that every thing which had passed with respect to articles of faith should be deemed null, and another creed composed: and they produced one, in which Christ is said to be *God of God, and like the Father who begat him*, but in which the term *consubstantial* was rejected.

When this creed had been read, a great majority who were not disposed to favour the emperor said, they did not come thither to fix a creed, because none was wanted, but to repress any innovations that might have been made in any article of faith; and therefore, if there was nothing new in the creed which was presented, they might proceed to the condemnation of the Arian doctrine, which had been the cause of so much mischief in the world. On this the bishops were divided,

VOL. II.

U

some

* Sulp. Sever. Lib. ii, Cap. 41. p. 267;

some receiving the new creed, and others adhering to the Nicene.

The advocates for the Nicene creed addressed a letter to the emperor, intreating him to permit that creed to continue to be the standard of faith, without making any more innovations, and to allow them to return to their sees. But Valens and Ursacius (who had been deposed by the other party in this council, because they would not join them in their condemnation of Arianism) arriving before the ambassadors from the council, preposessed the mind of the emperor against them; so that without giving them a hearing, on the pretence of public business, he referred them for an audience to another time and place. To this message the bishops returned an answer, repeating their request of permission to return home, since they could not recede from their determinations; and hearing nothing from the emperor in reply, Socrates says they dismissed themselves, and returned to their respective cities. But this appears not to have been the case, as they were detained by the præfect Taurus.

At this endeavour, at least, to dismiss themselves the emperor was greatly exasperated, as if these bishops had acted in contempt of him. He therefore ordered the creed which had been presented by Ursacius and Valens to be tendered to all
the

the bishops of Italy, before they left Ariminum. The greater part being intimidated, complied, and those who would not subscribe it, were banished, which occasioned great disturbances*.

Twenty of the party still made a resolute opposition, especially Phæbadius of Agen in Aquitaine and Servatio of Tongres ; but at length they were prevailed upon by the intreaties of Taurus, and the address of Valens and Ursacius, to sign the creed proposed to them. These urged that all that they could object to in the creed was that it was defective, not that it was untrue ; and that defect they might themselves supply, but that it was very desirable that the whole church should adopt the same formulary ; and by this time the bishops in the East, as well as all but themselves in the West, had consented to admit that the Son was *like the Father*, and that he was *not such as the other creatures*. In this, Sulpicious says, they were deceived ; as they signed what implied, though it did not express, that the Son was *a creature*.† Thus, as Jerom emphatically says, “ all the world sighed, and wondered to find itself Arian‡.”

It

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 37. p. 135.

† Ibid, Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 44. p. 276.

‡ Dialogus, Adv. Luciferianos, Opera, Vol. I, p. 427.

It appears, Fleury observes, that the bishops of this council attempted to get the lands belonging to churches exempted from all public taxes, but that the emperor refused his consent. Afterwards, being at Antioch, A. D. 361, he exempted the clergy from all extraordinary taxes*.

The party of Ursacius and Valens having left Italy, assembled at Nice in Thrace, and there formed a council, in which the creed which had been presented at Ariminum was ratified, with a view, as their adversaries gave out, that this should pass for the ancient Nicene creed. But the fraud would have been so palpable that it cannot be supposed that any set of men would have attempted it.

While these things were transacting in the West, the Arians in the East, having the favour and power of the emperor, expelled from their sees all the bishops who were not of their party; and in this Macedonius of Constantinople was the most active. The persecution also extended to the Novatians, because with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity they were orthodox, and the chief of their bishops, Agelius, had recourse to flight. It is said even torture was applied to compel persons to join the Arians; and a variety of horrid and improbable barbarities are mentioned by Socrates, on the testimony of one Auxanon, a very old man, and a presbyter

* Lib. 14. Cap. 12, Vol. iii, p. 512.

ter among the Novatians, as having been committed on this occasion. In Paphlagonia the Novatians withstood the soldiers who were sent to enforce the persecuting orders, and after losing many of their own number, killed them all. This Socrates says he had from a person who was present in the battle.

This violence of Macedonius gave great offence to those of his own party, and to the emperor himself, who was also much displeased with him, because without his leave, he had removed the body of Constantine from the Church in which it had been deposited, into another, on pretence that the building in which it had been put was become ruinous, so that there was great danger of its falling, and maiming those who might be passing near it. Others, however, and especially the orthodox, had made so much opposition to the removal of the body, that the two parties coming to blows in the church itself, much slaughter was made on both sides*.

When the Western council was called at Ariminum, the Eastern bishops had been summoned to meet at Nicomedia ; but they were obliged to leave that place presently after they had begun to assemble, on account of an earthquake, in which the church where the council was to have been celebrated

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 38, p. 145.

celebrated, Philostorgius says, was overthrown, and Cecropius bishop of the city and fifteen other bishops who were also in it, were buried in the ruins*.

Being driven from this place, the bishops assembled at Seleucia in Isauria, to the number of one hundred and fifty. But the issue of this council was not more favourable than that of the West. For some, as Macedonius and others, fearing to have their conduct enquired into, did not attend, and those who did attend differed in opinion, some refusing to consider any article of faith till they had decided concerning those who had been accused, and others contending for the discussion of a creed in the first place. The emperor's own directions on the subject also were various. The bishops were therefore divided into two parties, at the head of one, consisting of thirty, was Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre, and Eudoxius of Antioch; and at the head of the rest, who were the majority, was George of Laodicea in Syria, Sophronius of Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, and Eleusius of Cyzicum.

Coming at length to consider the articles of faith, the party of Acacius was for abolishing the Nicene creed, and composing a new one; but the
larger

* Lib. iv, Cap. 10, p. 506.

larger party were only for throwing out the term *confubstantial*. After some time, Sylvanus bishop of Tarsus cried out that they wanted no other creed besides that which had been agreed upon at Antioch. On this the friends of Acacius withdrew, and the rest, after shutting the doors of the church in which they were assembled, subscribed the creed of Antioch*.

After much altercation, the two parties were brought together again, and Acacius by means of the emperor's officers, contrived that after the exclusion of those who had been accused, a creed which he had prepared should be proposed; and in this both the terms *homoufios* and *homoiousios*, that is, *of the same*, or *of like substance*, as having been the occasion of much disturbance, were condemned; but it was asserted that the Son was *like the Father*; and that he was *begotten without passion before all ages*, and took flesh of the virgin. Such a creed as this might have been subscribed by almost all the contending parties. However it was not agreed to except by Acacius and his thirty followers.

The terms in which this creed (probably to avoid giving offence) was drawn up being ambiguous, a debate ensued to determine in what respects the Son was like the Father. The Acacians said
in

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 39, p. 149.

in *will* only, but the rest in *substance*. This debate took up a whole day ; and after refusing it to no purpose, the imperial officers dismissed the council. The majority, however did not leave the place but proceeded to examine those who had been accused. They moreover pronounced sentence of deposition against Acacius, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre, and many others. Some also they excommunicated, and among them was Asterius, till they should give satisfaction with respect to the crimes laid to their charge. After much more altercation on this and other subjects, the emperors officers returned to give an account of their proceedings to their master*.

Hilary of Poitiers, who was now in the fourth year of his banishment in Phrygia, was compelled to attend this council, and in it he gave an account of the faith of the Gallic church, which he declared to be agreeable to the decisions of the council of Nice, whereas the bishops of that country had been suspected of Sabellianism†.

The emperor being returned to Constantinople, Acacius and his friends complained to him that the creed which they had presented had not been received ; and continuing some time in the city, they called a council of the bishops of Bythia,
fifty

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 40. p. 151.

† Sulp. Severus, Lib. ii, Cap. 42. p. 270.

fifty in all, and among them Maris of Chalcedon, when they subscribed the creed which had been presented at Ariminum, with the alteration of a few words only, calling Christ *God of God*, rejecting the phrase *of the same substance*, and adopting that of *like substance*, with the addition of the words *according to the scriptures*, to which the Aetians could not object, because in the scriptures it is said that man was made after the image of God, or like to God. They also rejected the word *hypostasis*, as not mentioned in the scriptures*.

Thus the emperor in some measure gained his point, as his father had done before him. The Nicene creed, containing the phrase *of the same substance*, had been subscribed by the objecting party in the preceding reign, after some explanation; and so also had the phrase *of like substance*, which was the Shiboleth of the present reign, been subscribed by the opposite parties. But what signifies an agreement in words when mens ideas and opinions are really different.

VOL. II.

W

S E C.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 41. p. 155.

SECTION VII.

Transactions relating to Arianism subsequent to the Council of Seleucia, A. D. 359, and of the Council of Constantinople A. D. 360.

THOUGH the great object of Acacius and Eudoxius was the deposition of their opponents, our historian observes that neither party, though they differed with respect to articles of faith, deposed the others on that account, but only for crimes laid to their charge. Thus they deposed Macedonius as having been the author of much bloodshed, and because he had admitted to communion a deacon taken in adultery. For crimes real or supposed (for some of them are too heinous to be easily credited) they deposed Eleusius of Cyzicum, Basil of Ancyra, Neonas of Seleucia, Sophronius of Pompoiopolis, Elpidius of Satala in Armenia, Cyril of Jerusalem, and many others*.

Theodoret gives a particular account of what passed between Constantius and the bishops who repaired to Constantinople, at the second dedication of the church of Sancta Sophia,† from the
council

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 42. p. 157.

† This was thirty four years after Constantine had laid the foundation of it. On this occasion Constantius

council of Seleucia, which if it may be depended upon sufficiently discovers the emperor's opinion and temper, and throws much light on the ecclesiastical history of this period. Acacius complaining of those who composed the council at Selucia, as being assembled for the ruin of the church, the emperor was much provoked at him; but more especially for his accusation of Cyril of Jerusalem, on account of his selling a rich robe which Constantine had given to his church, and which had been afterwards bought by some players, and used on a public theatre. On this the emperor's friends advised him to assemble, not a council, but ten of the principal bishops, of whom were Cæsarius of Armenia, Basil of Galatia, Sylvanus of Tarsus, and Eleusius of Cyzicum.

These being assembled, advised the emperor to inquire into the blasphemies and unjust proceedings of Eudoxius. But the emperor chose first to discuss the article of faith, and then proceed to the enquiry concerning Eudoxius. On this Basil presuming upon the liberty which he had been used to take with the emperor, reproved him, in an ironical manner, as undermining the faith of the church.

made rich presents to the church, especially vessels of gold and silver. He also made valuable presents to the clergy, to the virgins, the widows, and the hospitals. Fleury, A. D. 360.

church. But Constantius, not taking it in good part, bade him be silent, and said that he was always raising disturbances. On this, Basil saying nothing more, Eustathius said to the emperor, " Since you chuse to discuss the articles of faith, see what blasphemies Eudoxius has uttered against Christ ;" and at the same time presented a treatise concerning faith, in which was the following passage ; " Things that are produced in a dissimilar manner, differ with respect to their substance. But we read *there is one God the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things.*" But the phrases *by whom*, and *of whom* are dissimilar, and therefore the Son must be dissimilar with respect to the Father.

Constantius being much offended at this, and asking Eudoxius if he wrote the book, he denied it, and said it was written by Aetius, assisted by George of Alexandria, who at that time resided together with Eunomius at the house of Eudoxius. For when, on the death of Leontius, Eudoxius took possession of the see of Antioch, Aetius returned from Egypt, and brought Eunomius with him. Then the emperor ordered Aetius to be introduced, and shewing him the passage above mentioned, asked him if that was his writing, when he not knowing for what purpose that question was put, acknow.

SECT. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 165

acknowledged it ; and in consequence of it the emperor immediately banished him to some place in Phrygia*.

Eustathius, however, maintained that Eudoxius was of the same opinion with Aetius, alleging that Aetius was his guest, and lived in intimacy with him at the time of his writing the book ; and in proof of this he alleged that nobody knew of Aetius, writing it besides Eudoxius. But the emperor saying that a judge ought to make proper inquiry before he determined, Eustathius proposed that Eudoxius should satisfy them, all that he did not approve of the treatise of Aetius, by pronouncing an anathema upon it. Constantius approving of this, Eustathius began to make evasions ; but when he was threatened to be banished, as well as Aetius, he no longer hesitated to disclaim the doctrine ; though both before and afterwards he never ceased to defend it.

Eudoxius however, in his turn objected to Eustathius, and said that for the same reasons that
he

* Philostorgius says that, when the emperor was informed by Acacius, that Aetius was well received by Auxentius bishop of Mopsuestia, whither he had been banished, he sent him to Amblas, that he might end his days miserably through the barbarity of the inhabitants. Lib. 7. Cap. 2, p. 506.

he had given, he ought to condemn the word *consubstantial* as not being found in the scriptures. But Sylvanus replied, that there was the same reason for rejecting the phrases of Christ being *made out of nothing, a creature, and of another substance* from God. For since these phrases do not occur in the scriptures, they ought not to be introduced into public worship. To this the emperor assented, and ordered Eudoxius to pronounce an anathema on those phrases.

At first they would have evaded it, but perceiving the emperor to be in earnest, they very unwillingly pronounced the condemnation required; insisting however on the term *consubstantial* being condemned likewise. But Sylvanus with great ingenuity replied, "if God, the word, be not *out of nothing, nor a creature, nor of another substance,* he must be *of the same substance* with God, as *God of God, light of light,* having the same nature with his Father."

But, says our author, though he argued very justly, he did not convince any of them; and a great clamour being raised by the faction of Acacius and Eudoxius, the emperor was angry, and threatened the other party to eject them from their churches. Then Eusebius and Sylvanus, with some others, told the emperor that it was his business indeed to punish, but theirs to judge of piety and

and impiety, and that they would never betray the religion of their ancestors. Though Constantius, says our author, ought to have admired these men for their courage, in defending the doctrine of the apostles, he banished them from their respective sees, and ordered other persons to be put in their places. In consequence of this Eudoxius got possession of the see of Constantinople, and Eleusius being banished from Cyzicum, Eunomius was put in his place*.

When these transactions were over, Constantius ordered the bishops who were assembled to pass a sentence of condemnation on Aetius in a formal writing; and on this, says our historian, the favourers of his impiety condemned their colleague. They even wrote to George bishop of Alexandria, to inform him of what had been done against Aetius at the same time that they sent him the decrees of the synod. This letter, a copy of which was sent

* Philostorgius says, that Basil of Ancyra, and Eustathius of Sebastia, accused Eudoxius and Aetius of favouring the party of Gallus, and that Constantius gave credit to them and the woman, whom they had gained to their party. He adds, that more than seventy bishops of Eudoxius's party were banished by the contrivance of Basil of Ancyra and his friends. Lib. iv. Cap. viii. p. 504.

200 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VIII.

sent to other bishops, it may not be amiss to produce as a specimen of such writings.

“ The holy synod assembled at Constantinople,
“ to their dear brother George bishop of Alexan-
“ dria.”

“ In the condemnation of Aetius by the synod
“ for his notorious and scandalous writings, the
“ bishops did what was agreeable to the ecclesiasti-
“ cal canons. He was deposed from his deacon-
“ ship, and expelled from the church. We have
“ likewise given admonitions, that his wicked epif-
“ tles be not read, but rejected as useless; and
“ have added that, if he do not retract his opini-
“ ons, he and his followers shall be anathema-
“ tized. In agreement with this all the bishops
“ who were convened at this council should have
“ execrated him as the author of scandals, tumults,
“ dissensions, universal murmuring, and sedition a-
“ mong the churches, and have agreed in the sen-
“ tence that was passed upon him. But, contrary
“ to our expectation, and that of every body, Ser-
“ ra, Stephanus, Heliodorus, Theophilus, and
“ the rest of the party, neither agreed to our suffra-
“ ges, nor subscribed the sentence that we passed
“ upon him, though Serra himself blamed another
“ of the mad boastings of Aetius. For he said he
“ had the impudence to assert, that what God had
“ conceal-

SEC. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 169

“ concealed from the apostles, had been revealed
“ to him.

“ Yet, after giving testimony concerning these
“ mad and arrogant speeches of Aetius, the per-
“ sons above mentioned could by no intreaties
“ be prevailed upon to join us in the condemna-
“ tion of him. We however, with singular pati-
“ ence, spared them a long time, urging and intreat-
“ ing them, by every mode of address, to make
“ the sentence of the synod unanimous. But this
“ being without any effect, thinking that the ca-
“ nons of the church ought to be preferred to their
“ friendship, we have decreed that they shall be
“ separated from our communion; allowing them,
“ however, the space of six months for repentance
“ and agreement with us. But if, within that
“ time they do not concur in the condemnation of
“ Aetius, we pronounce them deposed from their
“ episcopal dignity, and others must of course be
“ put in their places, that the catholic church may
“ be in agreement with itself; all the bishops in all
“ places keeping the bond of brotherly love, all
“ saying the same thing, and having the same opi-
“ nion and will.

“ This we write to inform you of the decrees of
“ the synod, praying that by adhering to them,
“ you may govern the churches which are subject

“ to you by the grace of Christ in peace, and according to order*.”

From what passed at this council, at which the emperor was present, the reader may easily judge of the authority of councils in general. For we may take it for granted that princes and other persons who have power, always direct such assemblies as they please ; so that their decisions are by no means the serious deliberate opinions of the majority of the members, but the pleasure of one or a few, and that generally dictated by their interest.

Macedonius, being expelled from Constantinople, joined those bishops who had deposed Acacius at Seleucia, urging them to adhere to the creed of Antioch, in which the term *of like substance* was inserted ; and from that time this party was distinguished by the name of *Homoiousians*. They were also joined by Eustathius, who had been expelled from Sebastia.

The friends of Acacius wished to have another council, and the year following, viz. A. D. 360, the emperor himself being present, they were assembled at Antioch. But few of them were for calling in question what had been decreed before ; saying that the term *of like substance* ought to be expunged both from the creed of Ariminum, and that

* Theod. Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 27, &c. p. 110, &c.

that of Constantinople. In their debates on this occasion they avowed that the Son was *unlike the Father both in substance and will* and likewise *made out of nothing*, doctrines which were held by the disciples of Aetius at Antioch. Being interrogated why they had subscribed the other creeds in which the term (*ἐκ θεοῦ*) of God, had been used ? they said that, according to the apostle *all things are said to be (ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) of God*, and that for this reason they had added the words *according to the scriptures*. George of Laodicea was the inventor of this evasion. The friends of Acacius, however, not insisting on what they had proposed, not chusing to bear the reproach of inconsistency, subscribed the creed of Constantinople, and then the bishops dismissed themselves*.

S E C-

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 45, p. 161.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Method by which the Trinitarians distinguished themselves from the Arians at Antioch and Observations on the Progress of Arianism in this Reign.

THE manner in which the orthodox took to distinguish themselves from the heterodox, with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, by ascribing glory to the Father, Son, and Spirit, at the conclusion of their hymns, was begun at Antioch in this reign. The custom had been, Philostorgius says, to ascribe glory to the Father by the Son in the Holy Spirit, or, in the Son and the Holy Spirit, but that Flavianus of Antioch introduced the custom of ascribing glory to the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.* Some, however, pronounced this doxology in one way, and others in another. In this difference Leontius the bishop did not chuse to interfere, but, pointing to his grey hairs, said, "when this snow shall be dissolved, much mud will be left behind;" intimating, that when

he

* Socratis Lib. iii. Cap. 13, p. 497.

he should be dead, much mischief would arise from these party distinctions*.

The method of singing alternately here alluded to, was introduced into the church of Antioch by Flavianus and Diodorus, who had embraced a monkish mode of life, and who (as was ever after the case with the monks in general) were zealous for the highest orthodoxy of times with respect to the doctrine of the trinity. These men being very popular, threatened Leontius that they would leave his communion if he did not degrade Aetius, whom he had made a deacon, and it is said that, in compliance with them, he did it, when in other respects he shewed him all the favour that he could; though Aetius himself said that he quitted the church of his own accord.

These two men, though not of the clergy, were continually taking the lead among the people in all pious exercises. They were the first who divided the choir of singers into two parts, and taught them to sing the psalms of David in alternate verses, a custom which from Antioch spread itself into all christian churches, in every part of the world. The chaunting in our cathedrals was derived from it. These two men would often pass the whole night with a number of people in the churches, singing psalms in this new manner; and, at the request

* Sozomeni-Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 20, p. 126.

quest of Leontius, they did the same in time of public worship*.

It is evident, that, notwithstanding Arianism took its rise some time before the council of Nice, yet that nothing that we should not think deserving of the name, was openly avowed by any set of men till towards the close of the reign of Constantius, when the *Actians* afterwards called *Eunomians*, professed that as the son was made out of nothing, he must be of a substance different from that of the Father. Nay, the proper opinions of Arius, viz. that the son was made out of nothing, and that there was a time when he did not exist, were really adopted by very few, if any, till the period of which we are now treating; and it is even not improbable that Arius himself receded from these opinions before he died; so that what we now call *Arianism*, rose much later, and spread much less rapidly than has been generally imagined.

In all the councils of which we have seen an account in the reign of Constantius, we find creeds not materially different from that of Nice. For though the bishops who composed some of them reprobated the term *consubstantial*, they adopted other phrases that were nearly, if not altogether, equivalent to it. Consequently the great body of the favourers of Arius did not entirely adopt his opinions,

* Theod. Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 24, p. 106.

SECT. VIII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 175

opinions, but rather favoured him as a man ill used, and one whose opinions had no great harm in them. They blamed the violence of his adversaries, and seriously objected to the term *consubstantial*, as having been rejected by the first council of Antioch, and favouring the opinion of the divine essence being material. At the same time they really believed, with the Antinicens Fathers in general, that the logos was the personified attribute of the Father, and therefore not produced from any thing besides *himself*, and therefore in all respects *like himself*.

It is not to be supposed that those who actually subscribed the Nicene creed, even after their being banished for refusing to do it, dissembled their opinions, or subscribed what they did not believe, but for the reasons which they alleged, and which have been reported. With the explanations of the term *consubstantial* which accompanied their subscriptions, I have no doubt that they were very sincere. Besides, if it could be supposed that there was an adequate motive for their hypocrisy in the reign of Constantine, there was no temptation to act the same hypocritical part in that of Constantius.

That Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had the confidence of Constantine in all the latter part of his life, and who, till the time of his death was the leader

der of that party which favoured Arius the most, was nevertheless far from being what we should now call an Arian, may be safely concluded from the sentiments of Eusebius of Cæsarea, who was of the same party, and who was always in high favour with Constantine. From his writings, which are numerous, there can be no doubt of his having been a believer in an *uncreated* *logos*, and of his having in all other respects held what had been generally deemed the orthodox doctrine concerning the person of Christ, till the council of Nice; though he probably did not adopt the opinion which arose in his own time, and which afterwards acquired the stamp of orthodoxy, viz. that of God having been *always a Father*, and therefore that of the Son having been *always*. This therefore I take to have been the case of Eusebius of Nicomedia and those who were of his party.

Indeed the system of Arianism cannot be said to have been completed till after the time of Apollinaris, who first maintained that in the incarnation the *logos* was united to a human body only, itself supplying the place of the intellectual principle, or the soul; or since the immaterial part of man was by many supposed to be two fold consisting of *vous*, and *ψυχη*, the *intellectual* and *sensible* part the *logos* was in the place of the former of them. But as Apollinaris himself supposed the

the *logos* to be uncreated, he could not be called an Arian*. However, they who adopted his opinion of the *logos* supplying the place of a human soul in the person of Christ, and supposed with Arius that the *logos* was *created out of nothing*, were properly Arians, or such as are now so denominated.

It is something remarkable that, as the doctrine of a *created logos* followed that of an *uncreated* one in the person of Christ (so that Arianism, in the first of its elements, was founded upon trinitarianism) the Arians, learned of Apollinaris, a trinitarian, to abandon the idea of a human soul in Christ. Without this, however, they must in time have come to the same conclusion, in reflecting upon their principles, and the natural consequences of them.

Before the end of this reign, the followers of Aetius, or rather Eunomius, separated themselves from those who had been called Arians, and came to have a separate denomination, in the following manner, as related by Theodoret. Notwithstanding the forced condemnation of Aetius by Eudoxius and Acacius, he continued to live in friendship with them, and was by them advanced to the rank of bishop. Eunomius having got possession of the church of Cyzicum, while Eleusius their former

VOL. II.

Y

bishop

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 46. p. 163.

bishop was still living, Eudoxius, who well knew the sentiments of the people, as well as the aversion which the emperor had to his opinions, advised him to conceal them as much as he could for the present. But though he did this, he was brought by a stratagem to declare himself openly in the church, and this gave occasion to his adversaries to accuse him before the emperor, who ordered Eudoxius to inquire into the case, and to depose him if the allegation was true. After many delays, Eudoxius found himself obliged to do this, but notwithstanding all his apologies, Eunomius complained of being ill used by him; and from that time he formed separate congregations, and his followers were called *Eunomians**.

The Eunomians, as I have already observed, were the first Arians who properly avowed that Christ was *a creature*, so as to be of a nature *unlike* that of God. Still, however, it does not appear that as yet even these Arians had any idea that their created logos supplied the place of a human soul in the person of Christ. It is probable that for a long time this logos was supposed to possess the mind of Christ in much the same manner as the Gnostic Christ was supposed to have taken possession of the man Jesus, or as dæmons were imagined to take possession of men, being a principle superadded to the soul and body in conjunction.

The

* Theod. Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 29. p. 114.

The Arians spread themselves not only through all the provinces of the Roman empire, but among the barbarous nations also, both in this and the preceding reign. Among those who were carried captive by the Goths from Asia Minor, in the time of Gallienus, were the ancestors of Ulphilas of Cappadocia. This Ulphilas, being sent ambassador, among other persons, from the king of the Goths to Constantine, was ordained bishop of the Goths by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and his friends. He translated into the Gothic language almost all the books of scripture, and was highly esteemed by Constantine, who was used to call him the Moses of the age, though he was an Arian, as well as the Goths who were instructed by him.*

Philostorgius says that the Indians who had been converted to christianity by the apostle Bartholemew, held that the Son was unlike the Father, and that Theophilus, an Indian, informed the Arians in the Roman empire that such was their opinion. This however he would naturally say, if they had been properly *Unitarians*, which was most probably the case. For, believing Christ to be a mere man, they must of course have thought that his nature was unlike that of God, as much as the Arians did concerning their logos. The people who are here called Indians were not those

* Philostorgii Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 5, p. 480.

those of Indostan, but a people of Arabia Felix, near the sea coast, being the same that are called Sabæans, and likewise Homerites*.

This Theophilus was sent ambassador by Constantius to the king of the Homerites, on purpose to engage him to embrace the christian religion ; and it is said that he succeeded, and built three churches in that country†. After this Theophilus proceeded farther, and corrected whatever he found to be amiss in the churches already established in India : but he had no occasion to rectify their opinion concerning Christ, as they had always considered him as being of a substance unlike that of the Father‡. After this Theophilus returned into the Roman territories, where he was much esteemed by the emperor, though he had no bishoprick assigned him.

* Phil. Lib. ii. Cap. 6. p. 481. Lib. iii, Cap. 4. p. 486.

† Lib. iii, Cap. 4, p. 488.

‡ Lib. iii, Cap, 5. p. 488.

S E C T I O N IX.

Of the Death and Character of Constantius.

CONSTANTIUS, hearing that Julian, after being successful in his wars in Gaul, had, without his consent, accepted the title of *Emperor*. and *Augustus* from the army, began to march against him from Antioch, where he was when he heard the news; and finding himself indisposed on his march through Cilicia was baptized, which, like his Father, he had omitted to be before: but being seized with an apoplexy, he died in the fortieth year of his age, and the twenty-fifth of his reign*.

Constantius, like his father, was no doubt very sincere in his profession of christianity, and had the best intentions in his endeavours to aid it by civil power. But his reign, like that of his father, affords a striking lesson of the risque that Christianity runs in such an alliance with the kingdoms of this world. What did it produce in this case but discord instead of harmony, and mischiefs of every kind, with whatever is most contrary to the spirit

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 47, p. 164.

spirit and practice of christianity. So far, however, was Constantius from having perceived the impropriety of his conduct in this respect, that Philostorgius says that just before his death, he had appointed another council to meet at Nice, in order to examine the opinions of those who held that the Son was of a substance different from that of the Father. Acacius, he says having accused Eunomius and Eudoxius, the emperor sent for the former to Antioch, and there called a synod to examine the charge against him ; but no accuser appearing, the emperor was much displeased with Acacius, and referred the discussion of the affair to the future council*.

The private life of Constantius was in the main irreproachable, though, like many other well meaning princes, he had the weakness to be influenced by favourites, and to be governed by passion. That he had a strong sense of religion, though mixed with superstition, appeared in a remarkable manner when he was marching against Magnentius. For, assembling his troops, he exhorted them all to be baptized ; telling them that life was always uncertain, but especially so in war, and he ordered all those to return home who did not chuse to comply, as he was determined that none should

fight

* Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap, 5, p. 511.

fight under him who were not baptized*. This story (which, I see no reason to question the truth of) is the more remarkable, as at that time the emperor himself was not baptized. But he might not think himself in so much personal danger as those who fought under him.

SECTION X.

*Of the Persecution of Christians in Persia, in the
Reign of Constantius, A. D. 343.*

THE persecution of christians was by no means confined to the Roman empire. Similar causes necessarily produce similar effects in all places ; and christianity was equally hostile to every species of idolatry, with all of which it had been taken for granted that the welfare of the states in which they were practised was connected. The progress of it, therefore, could not fail to give general alarm, and especially would it highly irritate those who were immediate gainers by the old superstitions ; which must have been the case with
great

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 3, p. 125,

184 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. VIII.

great numbers in all civilized and opulent countries, in all of which large funds were appropriated to the support of religion, funds from which several persons of considerable rank and consequence derived great emoluments.

The reason why we have fewer accounts of persecutions without the bounds of the Roman empire, is because there were no writers at that time in those countries, at least that are come down to us. By means of the Greek writers, however, we know some little of what was transacted in the countries bordering upon the Roman empire, with which the Greeks and Romans had always some intercourse. We have, for example, a tolerably authentic account of the persecution of christian by Sapor II. king of Persia, in this period, viz. A. D. 343.

When the christians were considerably increased in Persia, the Magi and the Jews in conjunction, who were equally irritated against them, in order to instigate Sapor to persecute them, accused Simeon bishop of Seleucia, and Ctesiphon, of being an enemy to Persia, and of giving intelligence concerning the state of it to the Romans. In consequence of this information, Sapor, suspecting all the christians of the same disaffection, loaded them with heavy taxes, destroyed their churches, and confiscated their sacred vessels, &c. He moreover

verfentenced all the clergy to death; and when Simeon, who was brought into his prefence, refufed even to prostrate himfelf before him, as had been the cuftom with refpect to the kings of Perfia, or consent to worfhip the fun, he was fubjected to grievous torture, which he bore with great fortitude.

While he was in prifon, Uftazades, a favourite eunuch of the king, being mortified at the indignation with which Simeon treated him on account of his conforming to the idolatry of the country, out of complaifance to the king, refolutely declared himfelf a christian, and was put to death, and afterwards an hundred others, all either bifhops, or of fome order of the clergy; and being affifted by the exhortations of Simeon, they fhewed the greateft conftancy. Laftly himfelf, and two other old men, Abdechalaas and Ananias, were put to death. Alfo Pufices, the chief of the king's artizans, being perceived to encourage Ananias, was not only put to death, together with his daughter, who was a nun, but previous to his execution, he had his tongue torn out in a peculiarly cruel manner.

The year following, about the time of Eafter, Sapor ordered that not only the clergy, but all his christian fubjects without exception, fhould fuffer death; and then the number of martyrs was prodigious; the Magi being affiduons in their accufations,

tions, and the christians not declining what they called the crown of martyrdom. On this occasion many of the courtiers suffered, and particularly Azadā, a favourite eunuch, whose death affected the king so much, that from this time he confined the persecution of the christians to the clergy.

About the same time some Jews accused Tabula, the sister of Simeon above-mentioned (who, together with two other women, had devoted herself to a single life) of causing the illness of the queen, by means of some charms, in revenge for the death of her brother. The queen being inclined to judaism gave credit to the accusation; and in consequence of this, all the three were put to death, by being sawn through the body.

3. This persecution by king Sapor fell the heaviest on the province of Adiabene, where the christians were very numerous. Acepsimas, a bishop, and many of his clergy, were seized at the same time. But the persecutors contenting themselves with the bishop, dismissed the inferior clergy, after confiscating all their effects. James, however, a presbyter, chose to remain with his superior, and ministered to him in the cruel usage to which he was exposed, in consequence of his refusing to worship the sun. Acepsimas was tortured to death, but some Armenians privately conveyed away his remains, and buried them. Others of the clergy were

were cruelly tortured, but survived ; and one of them, Aithalas, a presbyter, had his arms so stretched, that he never recovered the use of them.

The number of clergy who suffered martyrdom in this persecution was very great. Sozomen has preserved the names of twenty two of the bishops ; and he says that all the martyrs, including men and women, were supposed to amount to no less than sixteen thousand*.

Sozomen places this persecution in the reign of Constantine, and supposes him to have written the *letter to Sapor*, mentioned before, on this occasion. But as neither Eusebius, nor any contemporary writer, speaks of any particular persecution of the christians in Persia at that time, it is most probable, that it was in the seventh of Constantius, where Jerom in his *Chronicle*, places such a persecution, as was noticed by Baronius†.

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. ii. Cap: 9, 15, p. 56. &c.

† Annales, A. D. 343.

SECTION XI.

Of the Donatists in this Reign.

IT is probable that the Donatists kept increasing in number during this reign, through the whole of which they continued to be persecuted, as they had been in the reign of Constantine.

The emperor Constans, in whose government Africa was, actuated by the zeal of his family for the *peace of the church* sent to persons of rank, Paul and Macarius, A. D. 348, to endeavour to conciliate the Donatists, and at the same time to distribute alms to the poor. But the Donatists were not to be conciliated, and it is said opposed these ambassadors by force, the Circumcelliones intercepting their donations. To all their overtures for peace they replied, *Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia.* "What has the emperor to do with the church;" an excellent saying, and worthy to be adopted by all christians, though on this occasion it might have been prompted by the injuries the Donatists had received from the emperor*.

About

* Optatus, Lib. iii, p. 66.

It was also usual with them to say *Quid christianis cum regibus, aut quid episcopis cum palatio?* "What

About the end of the reign of Constantine, A. D. 349, a council was held at Carthage, where Gratian was bishop, in which canons were made against the Donatists' practice of rebaptizing, and against considering those of them as martyrs who destroyed themselves by throwing themselves from precipices, &c.* It is obvious to remark that, if any of them did this, it is a proof that they were driven to it by extreme despair, in consequence of the greatest violence. For the Donatists were *men*, and no man will voluntarily destroy himself if they be permitted to live in peace.

SECTION XII.

Of the Monks in this Reign.

I HAVE made some mention of Anthony, the first of the monks of Egypt, in a former period. His fame was so great, that he had many imitators, not only in Lybia and Egypt, but also in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. They all adopted the same course of life that he had done, and like

“ have christians to do with kings, or what have bishops to do at court ?” Ibid, Sect. i, p. 25.

* Binnii Concilia, Vol. i, p. 456.

like him had many followers. But the most eminent of his disciples was Paul, who joined Anthony on his wife proving unfaithful to him*.

Cotemporary with this Paul, was Ammon, who led the same monastic life in Egypt, and whose wife (with whom however he never had any commerce) followed the same mode of life, and was the first woman who did so. They lived in separate places near the lake Mareotis, and saw one another twice a year. He was the founder of many monasteries in that part of the world. Another eminent Monk, or rather Anchorite, in the time of Constantine, was Eutychianus, a Novatian who resided near mount Olympus in Bythinia†.

Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, was a great advocate for such maxims and observances as distinguished the monks, prescribing rules concerning diet, dress, &c. It is said that the book of monkish discipline, which was commonly ascribed to Basil of Cappadocia, was in reality written by him. His severity was so great that it led him to violate the established rules of the church. It is even said that he condemned marriage, that his disciples, at least, refused to pray in the house of a married person that they led some women to forsake their husbands, and even to dress themselves like

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. i, Cap. 13, p. 29.

† Ibid. Hist, Lib. i, Cap. 14. p. 29.

like men. On this account the neighbouring bishops assembled at Gangræ in Paphlagonia, and condemned all those peculiarities; and after this Eustathius himself, to shew that he was not refractory, conformed to the usual customs*. The council is supposed to have been held after this period, viz. A. D. 377.

SECTION XIII.

Of Pretensions to Miracles which began to be advanced, and to gain Credit, chiefly in this Period.

IN order to form a complete idea of this period of ecclesiastical history, it will be proper to recite some of the *miracles* which were pretended to be wrought in it; and I cannot give a fairer specimen of the credulity of the christian world in this respect than by giving some of the particulars of the life of Anthony, written by Athanasius. If the credulity of this extraordinary man carried him so far as to believe the truly ridiculous tales that he has recorded, we may safely conclude that the christian:

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 14, p. 115.

christian world in general was well disposed to listen to and receive them. Tales of this kind, however, do not by any means furnish a just objection to the truth of the miracles on which the truth of christianity was originally founded. It was the unquestionable authenticity of those miracles that made christians in general disposed to believe without sufficient examination reports concerning others which appeared calculated to confirm their faith. There is the greater reason for making choice of this account of pretended miracles, as I believe it is the first of the kind in point of time. After this the christian world was deluged with accounts of miracles performed by the living and the dead, and was the foundation of the canonization of those who were denominated *Saints*, and entitled to the worship of christians. It was, indeed, the principal circumstance necessary to procure canonization.

This Anthony, whose exemplary life made him to be exhibited as a pattern to succeeding monks, was a native of Egypt, of a wealthy family, who much against the wishes of his parents abandoned all his possessions and worldly prospects, to give himself up to a life of austerities and the exercises of devotion in the deserts adjoining to his country.

The most remarkable of the supernatural events, and those that occur the most frequently in this curious history, are his interviews with the devil

vil and demons. These gave him infinite disturbance in almost every imaginable way, and some of them are sufficiently ludicrous. After tempting this good man by various suggestions in the ordinary mode of his access to the minds of men, the devil one night assumed the form of a woman ; but this having no effect he appeared in the shape of a black boy, and addressed him in a human voice. Anthony asking him who he was, he said that he was *the spirit of fornication*. To this Anthony replied that he had now made himself perfectly contemptible, being black as his colour in mind, and weak as a boy whose appearance he had assumed ; adding “ the Lord being my helper “ I hold all my enemies in contempt.” On this the devil, being terrified, fled from him. This, says the writer was the first contest that Anthony had with the devil. But it was by no means the last.

The next time that he assailed him he was accompanied with a multitude of demons, and they beat him so cruelly, that from the excessive pain he lay on the ground, unable to speak ; tho’ at the same time he felt that he was able to bear any torture. After this he got himself conveyed into a tomb in the neighbourhood, where from the torture to which he had been exposed, not being able to stand, he prayed lying along on the ground. However, when he had finished his devotions, he

called to the demons with a loud voice, saying,
 " Here I am and do not wish to be spared any of
 " your blows. Nothing that you can do can sepa-
 " rate me from the love of Christ." The devil
 wondering at this, called his demons, and said to
 them, " You see that neither the spirit of fornicati-
 " on, nor the stripes we have given him have pro-
 " duced any effect ; we must assail him in some o-
 ther way."

In the night, therefore, making a dreadful noise,
 they burst into the hut in which he slept, in the
 forms of beasts and serpents ; so that the place was
 soon filled with the appearance of lions, leopards,
 bulls, serpents, asps, scorpions, and wolves, all of
 them attacking him in their own way ; the lion
 roaring as he rushed upon him, the bull pushing
 with his horns, &c. and each of them with a noise
 peculiar to his kind, and all shewing great wrath.
 Anthony, however, with the greatest fortitude bore
 all the pain they gave him ; and tho' it made him
 groan, he insulted them saying, " If you had the
 " power, one of you might have been sufficient to
 " assail me, but your power having been taken
 " from you by Christ, you think to terrify me by
 " your numbers ; and your assuming the forms of
 " brute animals is another confession of your weak-
 " ness. If, however, you have any power over
 " me, fall on, and if not, why do you give me this
 " disturbance." The demons not being able to
 prevail

prevail over him only gnashed their teeth. During all this Christ was present to his assistance ; for, lifting up his eyes, he saw the roof of the place uncovered, and a ray of light shining through it upon him. On this the demons disappeared, his pain left him, and the hut was found to have received no injury. He then asked why Christ had not come to his assistance sooner, and was answered, “ I was here, Anthony, but I waited to be a spectator of your combat ; and since you have not sunk under it, I shall always be your helper, and shall make your name famous in all places.” On this he rose, and prayed, and found himself stronger, than he had been before. This, the writer says, was when he was thirty-five years old.

The day after this the devil threw in his way a silver dish ; but Anthony, being aware of the artifice, said to the devil, “ May thy dish perish with thee,” on which he vanished as if he had been smoke. Proceeding farther, he found gold in his way, but only admiring the quantity of it, he passed by it as if it had been fire, hastening to a solitary hut, into which he did not suffer any person to enter. His friends, however, who staid without, heard a noise as of many persons with him, shouting, and saying to him, “ Get thee from us. What hast thou to do in the desert.” At first his friends thought that some persons, had, by some means or other, found their way to him ; but peeping through a chink,
and

and seeing no person, they concluded that the noise proceeded from demons, and called to Anthony; and he not answering, they forced their way to him, expecting to find him dead. But far from that, he was singing in the words of the Psalmist, "Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered; let them that hate him flee before him."

In this manner did Anthony live near twenty years, never coming out of his hut, and rarely seen by any body. At length however he was prevailed upon to come out, and then he was distinguished by the performance of many miracles of various kinds, especially the curing of diseases, and casting out demons; and being surrounded by disciples, he related to them in what manner he had repelled various attacks of demons while he had lived in that solitude.

At one time he said that one of them appeared of great stature, saying he was the great power of God, and asking him what he could do for him; but that he spat at him in the name of Christ; when he and all his companions soon vanished. Another time he said that he came in the form of a monk; saying he was sent to bring him victuals; but that he, knowing what he really was, began to pray, when the demon instantly fled. At another time he said that, hearing a knocking at his door, he opened it, and seeing a very tall person, he asked him who he was, and was answered *Satan*. He then

SECT. XIII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 197

then rehearsed a dialogue that passed between them, he complaining of Satan, and Satan in return complaining of the trouble that the monks gave him, when he had no power to hurt them. In this Anthony said he had confessed the truth, for that by the coming of Christ he had lost all his power. On hearing the name of Christ Satan instantly disappeared.

Not liking so much interruption from disciples, and so many persons continually applying to him, he was directed by a supernatural voice how to find his way to the inner Thebais ; and he reached it by joining a company of Arabs. Finding a convenient place well watered ; he lived there in part by his own labour, in cultivating the ground adjoining to him, and in part by the charity of the Arabs. But his water being resorted to by wild beasts, that were apt to do mischief in his garden, he took one of them, and mildly expostulating with him on the injury they did to him, when he did none to them, from that time they troubled him no more ; till some of them were sent by the devil of all the kinds that the desert contained, and especially hyenas. But when they came rushing upon him, he said to them, " If you have any power over me, I am ready to be devoured by you, but if you be sent by demons depart immediately, for I am the servant of Christ ;" and on this they instantly fled.

At

At another time he was visited by a beast with the form of a man as far as the thighs, but with the legs and feet of an ass. But on his signing himself with the sign of the cross, and saying, "I am the servant of Christ," this beast with his companions fled with so much haste, that he fell and died upon the spot. And the demons finding that they could not by any means in their power drive him from that place attempted it no more.

The writer then proceeds to relate several remarkable cures performed by Anthony of persons who were not brought to him, and of his seeing in a vision the situation of persons and things at a great distance from him. Among others he foresaw the death of the monk Ammon. For when he was sitting, and looking upwards, he saw the figure of a person carried through the air with great signs of joy, and expressing a wish to know the cause of it, he was told by a supernatural voice that it was the soul of Ammon, who was just then dead at the distance of thirteen days journey; and inquiry being made, it was found that he died exactly at that time.

This Anthony foresaw the rise and progress of the Arian heresy two years before it broke out, under the image of the communion table surrounded by mules kicking at it. He also foretold the death of an Arian persecutor, who was killed by the bite of
of

of his own horse, though before he had always been remarkable gentle. Lastly he foretold the time of his own death, which happened when he was one hundred and five years of age.

I have not recited all the extraordinary things that are contained in this curious history ; but I imagine they are sufficient to shew the faith of the great Athanasius, and the credulity of the age in which such works could be received and admired ; and this is but a small specimen of the ridiculous tales, chiefly originating with the monks, and propagated by them, which disgraced the cause of christianity from this time till the reformation. It is observable, however, that Athanasius neither says that he was himself present at any of those extraordinary miracles, or that he had made any particular inquiry into the authenticity of them. He only says that he had himself seen this Anthony.

We have of Jerom, who lived after Athanasius, a life of Paul, who preceded Anthony in the monastic life, and also of Hilarian who was his disciple, both written in the same spirit, and equal credulity, especially with respect to combats with the devil and demons. According to Jerom, Anthony arrived at the cell of Paul just before his death, and two lions scratched a grave for him, when Anthony was not able to do it. Hilarian, then living in Syria, is said to have foretold the death of Anthony, and immediately went to visit the cell in
which

which he had lived and died. But the place in which he was buried he found was to remain unknown, agreeably to the express order of Anthony himself.

Athanasius was soon followed by Gregory Nyssen in his account of pretended miracles. But he does not ascribe them to any person with whom he was at all cotemporary, but to one who had lived more than a century before him, viz. Gregory of Neocæsarea in Capadocia, a disciple of Origen, and held in the highest esteem by all the christian writers who have mentioned his name. Some of the works of this excellent man are extant, but in them we perceive no trace of the miracles ascribed to him, and the writer of his life appeals to no authority for what he advances ; and yet it is from this circumstance that his hero has obtained the appellation of *Thaumaturgus*.

The first thing of any importance that is ascribed to Gregory by this writer, is his having received a *creed* as from the mouth of John the Evangelist, after a conversation which he heard between him and the virgin Mary. But that this creed was not any that was given by John, or received by Gregory, is evident from its being a trinitarian creed ; whereas, to say nothing of John, it is probable that Gregory was an unitarian.

But perhaps the most palpably absurd of all the wonders ascribed to this excellent man, is that
having

having on a journey taken up his lodging in a heathen temple, the deity or demon that was worshipped there informed the priest that he could no more appear in that place on account of a person who had lodged there the preceding night. On this the priest followed and overtook Gregory, who, to satisfy him, wrote an order to the heathen god in these words, "Gregory to Satan, Enter." This writing being laid on the altar, the deity answered his worshippers as before. The priest then returned to Gregory, who farther to convince him of his power of working miracles, commanded a heavy stone that lay before them to remove, and settle in a distant place to which he directed it.

On his arrival at the city to which he was going in order to take upon him the bishoprick of it, he relieved all who applied to him, whether possessed with demons, or labouring under any disease. Many of them were relieved by pieces of linen on which he had only breathed. Two brothers quarrelling about a certain lake, he went to it and after his prayers it was dried up. Lastly, a river having done much damage to the country by overflowing its banks, he confined it within certain bounds, which it never afterwards passed.

It should seem that these miracles reported to have been performed in the East, exerted the emulation of Sulpicius Severus in the West, and that he was determined to make his tutor, Martin bi-

shop of Tours, as famous as Anthony had been made by Athanasius, or Gregory Thaumaturgus by Gregory Nyssen.

This Martin was a native of Pannonia, but educated in Italy, and for some years was in the army. Having quitted this mode of life, and being on a journey near Milan, he was met by the devil in a human form, who asked him, whether he was going; and he answering wheresoever the Lord should send him, he replied, "Wherever you go, or whatever you undertake, I will oppose you." To this Martin answered, "The Lord is my helper. I will not fear what man can do unto me."

Having established a monastery near Milan, a catechumen, who attended there to receive his instructions, died of a fever when Martin was absent. Returning three days after his disease, which happened before he was baptized, he ordered all persons to leave the room in which the body was laid; and after he had prayed with him two hours he came to life. He then related, that when he had left the body, he was carried before the tribunal of a judge, and received a dreadful sentence. But two angels informing the judge that he was the person for whom Martin prayed, he was by the same two angels carried back, and restored to life. From this time the historian says that Martin was universally considered as a saint, and an apostolic man.

After

After this he by his prayers recovered from death a man who had hanged himself.

After he was made bishop of Tours, finding that an altar had been raised to the honour of a supposed martyr, and being in doubt with respect to it, he went to the place, and praying, desired to be informed of the truth of the case ; when looking to his left hand, he saw a ghost standing near him in a sordid habit, and with a fearful countenance, and commanding him to speak, he said that he was a robber, who had been executed for his crimes, and had nothing in common with martyrs. The persons present, the historian says, heard the voice, but Martin only saw the ghost.

Going to demolish a heathen temple, and a large pine tree that was near to it, the priest and the people opposing him, proposed, that, as a proof of his authority, he should be bound, and placed in the way of the tree as it was falling. To this he readily consented ; and when the tree was actually falling upon him, he only raised his hand, and making the sign of the cross it suddenly moved from him, and fell upon some of the idolators who thought themselves in a place of perfect safety.

Being opposed in an attempt to demolish another heathen temple, two angels appeared to him in suits of armour ; saying they were sent by the Lord, to disperse the ruffic multitude, and preserve

serve him safe till the temple should be demolished. He therefore returned, and finished what he had undertaken, the country people saying they were withheld by some supernatural power from interrupting him, and becoming christians. At another time having presented his head to one of the company who opposed him in his attempt to demolish their temple, the man after raising his arm with the axe to strike him, suddenly fell backwards, and being terrified asked his pardon. And on another similar occasion the knife with which a man was going to stab him was suddenly taken from him, and could not be found.

As to the curing of diseases, and the casting out of demons, no person ever applied to him in vain. Even the shreds of his garments were sufficient for this salutary purpose. By means of the authority which he had over demons, he could avail himself of any intelligence that they could give him. The city being at one time alarmed with a report of an intended invasion by the barbarians, he ordered a demoniac to be brought to him in the church, and asked the demon before the congregation whether the report had any foundation in truth. The demon, thus questioned, said that the report had been propagated by fifteen demons with a view to make him leave the city; but that the barbarians had no intention of attacking it. Then the alarm ceased.

Martin

Martin had frequent interviews with angels, and he also often saw the devil, sometimes in his proper form, and sometimes in others. At one time the devil broke into his cell ; and shewing the horn of an ox stained with blood, he said, " Martin where
" is thy power now. I have killed one of thy
" monks." On this Martin called them all together, when it appeared that none of them was missing, but that a hired servant had been killed by an ox, as he was driving a waggon drawn by oxen. Many accidents of this kind, the historian says, he foretold before they happened.

The devil often appeared to Martin in the form of the heathen gods, especially that of Mercury but he always defended himself by the sign of the cross, and prayer. A multitude of demons were often overheard railing at him ; and at one time some of the fraternity declared that they had heard a dialogue between Martin and a demon ; the latter complaining of the injury that had been done him by receiving again some who had lost the benefit of their baptism by relapsing into heresy ; and that Martin, in vindication of his conduct, said, " Nay if thou, O wretch shouldest desist from
" harrassing mankind, and repent of thy wicked-
" nels, tho' now the day of judgment is at hand, I
" can assure thee of the mercy of Christ."

A man of the name of Anatolias having professed an attachment to the monks of Martin's
monastery

monastery, pretended, to have a conversation with angels, and even with God himself ; and as a proof of it, he said that on a particular night, which he mentioned, he was to be presented from heaven with a white garment. Accordingly on that night a great noise was heard in his cell, and he presently came out clothed in a garment of wonderful whiteness, and made of a kind of wool with which none of the monks were acquainted. But when they proposed to take him to Martin he was exceedingly averse to it ; and when he was compelled to go, the garment disappeared ; the devil, the writer says, well knowing that he could not conceal his artifice from him.

At one time the devil appeared to Martin in a magnificent dress, saying that he was Christ, who was come to appear to him before his descent to the earth. But Martin, aware of the cheat, said that Christ would not appear in that form, and that he would not be convinced unless he saw in him the marks of crucifixion in his hands and feet. On this the devil vanished like smoke, and left in the cell such a stench, as sufficiently proved that it could not have been any other than the devil. Lest this story the writer says should be thought fabulous, he declares that he had it from the mouth of Martin himself. The reader, however, will not doubt but that it was the impudent invention of one

one or other of them. He concludes his history with declaring in the most solemn manner, that he had related nothing but the truth, and expresses his hopes that whoever belived his account would receive a reward from God. He also says that he had not by any means related all that he might have done concerning this most extraordinary man. Indeed he relates many more anecdotes of him of a similar nature in his *Letters* and *Dialogues*. But my readers, I imagine, will think with me, that the specimen I have given them is sufficient to mark the gross imposition of some, and the credulity of others in this pretty early period, and he will readily excuse me if, contenting myself with what I have related in this section, I trouble him with little or nothing of the kind in the future progress of this work.

S E C-

SECTION XIV.

Of the Christian Writers from the Accession of Constantine, to the Death of Constantius.

THE writers within this period are sufficiently numerous; but as, from this time I shall not think it necessary, in general, to take notice of any besides the more considerable of those whose works are come down to us, I have not many to give an account of.

Arnobius was a native of Sicca in Africa; a teacher of rhetoric, and at first a strenuous defender of the heathen religion; but after his conversion to christianity he wrote one of the best treatises now extant against it.

Lactantius was a native of Italy, and a disciple of Arnobius, but was removed to Nicomedia by Diocletian, when he wished to make that city equal to Rome, and to introduce into it the liberal arts. Having few disciples, he employed himself chiefly in composing books, and he first distinguished himself by his defence of christianity against Hierocles, the president of Syria. He was afterwards made tutor to Crispus the son of Constantine. We have of him several treatises, which

which are so arranged as to have the title of *Institutions*, comprehending a system of christianity, and morals. We have also an epitome of the whole in a separate treatise. He is the most elegant of all the Latin christian writers.

The most valuable writer in this period is Eusebius bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, surnamed Pamphilus, on account of his friendship for Pamphilus the Martyr. He seems to have been master of all the knowledge of his age, and he had the particular confidence of Constantine, as appears by several of his letters to him, which he has preserved.

We have of this writer an ecclesiastical history in ten books, the only work of the kind now extant of that age, beginning with the origin of christianity, and describing its progress to the time of Constantine. The early part of it is very imperfect, no doubt for want of materials. The manner in which he expresses himself with respect to all those whose sentiments he disapproved shews that he may be justly suspected of partiality, and it certainly affects every thing he says concerning Unitarians of every kind. Indeed, two of his works are on the subject of this controversy, being written to confute Marcellus of Ancyra.

He likewise wrote a Chronicon, or chronology from the time of Abraham to that of Constantine, of which we have an imperfect copy in the Latin

of Ruffinus. But the most learned works of Eusebius are his *Preparation and Demonstration of the gospel*, in which he defends the cause of christianity, against heathens and Jews. We have likewise a particular treatise of his against Hierocles, in answer to what he had written against the christians, the *life of Constantine* in four books, an *oration in praise of Constantine* recited in his presence on the thirtieth anniversary of his reign; a *commentary on the psalms and on Isaiah*; and, in the Latin of Ruffinus, the first book of an *apology for Origen*, written by himself and Pamphilus in conjunction.

Among the writers and great men of this period, we must place Hierax of Leontopolis in Egypt, a person well skilled, according to Epiphanius, in all science, and especially in medicine, and who wrote in both the Greek and Egyptian languages. He was so well acquainted with the Old and New Testament, that he had them as it were by heart, and he wrote commentaries on them. He was particularly revered for the strictness of his virtue, abstaining from wine and all dainties, so that many of the monks of Egypt adopted his opinions, which were in some respects those of the Gnostics, as he denied the resurrection of the flesh, and reprobated marriage. The former of these he is said to have borrowed from Origen, and the latter was held by many who pretended to great purity. He had followers who bore his name, and who are by some,
but

Sec. XIV. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 211

but unjustly, ranked among the Manicheans. He lived to an extreme age, some say above ninety, retaining the perfect use of his eyes, and employing himself much in writing books, which he did in a very fair hand. Besides his commentaries on the scriptures, he wrote on the work of the six days, but nothing of his is now extant*.

The emperor Constantine himself must also have a place among the writers of his age, on account of the many letters of his which have been preserved by Eusebius and other writers, and especially his *oration to the congregation of saints*, or the christian church, in which he defends christianity, and the orthodoxy of the times concerning the person of Christ.

* Epiph. Hær; 67. Opera, Vol. i. p. 710, &c.

PERIOD

THE HISTORY OF THE PER. IX.

P E R I O D IX.

T H E R E I G N O F J U L I A N.

S E C T I O N I.

General Observations.

IF ever a wish could arise in the breast of a christian, for a heathen and persecuting emperor, it would be after perusing such a history as we have been considering, of the factions among the christian bishops during the reign of Constantius. Indeed, had there been nothing in christianity besides what appears upon the face of this part of our history, it would not be worth contending for. But all histories preserve the accounts of the turbulent, and in general the worst part of our species, of every description, civil as well as religious, while the quiet, the inoffensive, the benevolent, and truly virtuous characters walk in a sphere in which they very rarely attract much notice, and are therefore soon forgotten. More especially would this
this

this, be the case with christianity, the principles of which lead men to cultivate such virtues as make no figure in the bustle of the world.

Notwithstanding all that we have seen of the factious and unchristian spirit which prevailed among the more conspicuous of the bishops, even Julian, whose history is now coming before us, and whose testimony in this respect cannot be excepted against, bears witness to the exemplary morals of the christians in general, and even those of their ministers, as greatly superior to those of the heathens and their priests; and to this circumstance chiefly he ascribes the progress that, to his great regret, christianity made in the world.

Compared with the disposition of the generality of christians, the heathens knew nothing, in a manner, even of benevolence, and much less of piety. For the latter, indeed, their religion afforded them no object; and it was unquestionably a sense of their common relation to God, and to Christ, and their considering themselves as joint heirs of a happy immortality which inspired that ardent and generous benevolence, which was unknown in the world before the promulgation of christianity. *How these christians love one another,* was always, and indeed justly, the wonder of the heathens; and their general benevolence towards all mankind, without excluding even their enemies, was a new thing also; the attachments of the
heathens

heathens having been always limited to their relations, particular friends, their country, or some other near and small object. We have seen how, in time of distress and pestilence the generality of the heathens deserted even their nearest relations and friends, rather than run any risque to save them. And, indeed, to a man whose prospects are bounded by this life, what could justify the risque of it ?

On the other hand, the principles of christianity, which in the course of this history have been abundantly exhibited, led men to make no account of life, or of any of the advantages or disadvantages of it, when they came in competition with their known duty. Nay, many of the christians, we have seen, were improperly lavish of their lives, and contrary to the express commands of Christ (who was no enthusiast, like many of his followers) courted persecution, and were as ambitious of the honour of martyrdom, as many are of crowns. The uniform operation of these principles, heathen philosophers and emperors viewed with astonishment, but at the same time with hatred, as a thing of which they were not capable. These principles were entertained by all sincere christians, and they increased their attachment to each other, and gave such a generosity and energy to their sentiments, and conduct, as in the eyes of heathens must have made them appear a superior kind of beings with
respect

respect to themselves; and, independently of their future glorious prospects, they were, and appeared to be infinitely happier even here, when destitute of all worldly advantages, than their persecutors were in the enjoyment of them.

These virtues distinguish the great mass of christians, who were not within the influence of worldly ambition, as the leading bishops and clergy were; and even these men notwithstanding their great failings, were in general actuated by a sincere love of truth, though they adopted improper methods of promoting it. The most factious of them were not destitute of sincere piety, and even of benevolence, when they were not (as was too often unhappily the case) influenced by human passions, and led by uncommon incentives to indulge a spirit of pride and ambition. And it should be considered, that to have the command of so much wealth and power as many of the christian bishops were in possession of, especially in the time of the christian emperors, was a great temptation to persons bred in obscurity, as many of the more eminent of the bishops and clergy were.

In their most eager contests for pre-eminence, the christian bishops, in these factious times, were not inferior to the generality of statesmen and warriors; and when the profession of christianity became honourable and lucrative, it must be supposed

posed that many would class with christians, who had nothing of their religion but the name, and whose sole object was the temporary advantages which it happened to be the means of procuring them. Such men as these ought not to be considered as christians ; because, with the same disposition of mind, and the same prospects in this life, they would have professed any other religion.

Let us not then think lightly of the advantages of christianity, when we consider the effects of those human passions, which, in certain circumstances, the principles of it might not be able to controul. In every situation christianity did something in favour of those who really believed it. It contributed to improve their characters, though it did not always remove every defect. The good seed was sometimes choaked with thorns, and in other cases could hardly be distinguished among the tares which grew up with it ; but in favourable circumstances, it produced much good fruit, and such as nothing else could have yielded.

In the extremely low, and lamentably corrupted state to which christianity sunk in later ages, so as, in its external appearance, to resemble that very idolatry over which it triumphed, both in its objects and mode of worship, it was, radically and internally, infinitely superior to it, as it directed mens views to a state beyond the grave, and with a view to that strongly inculcated the government
of

of the passions. Professions have always some influence on practice; and the monks in every age professed, and, in general, I doubt not, sincerely endeavoured, to cultivate, amidst all their absurd mortifications, that humility, charity, piety and heavenly mindedness, to which the heathens made no pretensions at all. Many of their rites consisted in the grossest sensual indulgence, and the most indecent exhibitions, especially those in which Bacchus and Venus were the objects of worship; such as the rudest populace among christians; in any age, would have turned from with abhorrence. How prejudiced then must that man be, and how much to be pitied, who can at this day give the preference to the worship of the heathens, and fancy it to have the recommendation of *elegance*, and whose writings infuse those prejudices into others, who are destitute of sufficient knowledge of antiquity to be upon their guard against them.

SECTION II.

Of the Superstition of Julian.

THE reign that we are now going to take a view of was short, but of great importance in the history of christianity. It was its last and successful struggle against heathenism, which, though supported by a man of considerable ability and address, and who gave his whole mind to the subject, yet appeared in his conduct as despicable, and as malevolent, as ever it had done before. With respect to himself, it is lamentable to observe how an attachment to heathenism depraved a mind which was naturally far from being bad, and how it led a sensible man to adopt measures which for their meanness, as well as their injustice and cruelty, every man of sense must now condemn.

Julian was educated a christian, and kept, by his uncle, with perhaps too much care, from having access to any heathen masters. However, when he was at Nicomedia, where he was forbidden, to attend the lectures of Libanius, his orations, which fell into his hands gave him particular pleasure. But still he discovered ~~no~~ fondness for

for the heathen religion, though he was so great an admirer of the heathen writings, which would tend to recommend it to him, till the arrival of Maximus of Ephesus, of whom he both learned the rudiments of philosophy, and acquired a relish for the religion to which his master was bigottedly attached. Lest his propensity to heathenism should be suspected, he got his head shorn, and pretended to great fondness for the monastic life. He also became a reader in the church of Nicomedia; and he dissembled so well, that his christian friends do not appear in the least to have suspected that he was any other than they wished him to be.

Afterwards, being permitted to study philosophy at Athens, he had a better opportunity of learning the rites of his new religion, and of hearing the sneers of the heathen philosophers against christianity. There also he was initiated into those *mysteries* to which all persons had not access, and might learn those arts of divination and magic, which were always a flattering part of the heathen religion, and to which he was most superstitiously addicted.

How Julian acquitted himself as a commander in Gaul it is not my business particularly to relate. It is sufficient to say that he was the terror of his enemies, and that he gained the affections of his soldiers, so that they gave him the title of
Emperor

Emperor and Augustus. But before this, as soon as he began to feel his power, he acted independently of his uncle (who had discovered an imprudent jealousy of him) and no longer concealed his attachment to heathenism, but opened the temples in the cities through which he passed, offering sacrifices, celebrating festivals, and assuming the title of *Pontifex Maximus*. It was afterwards pretended by the heathens that, while he was in Gaul, he was induced to take up arms against his uncle by prophecies and oracles, which foretold the death of Constantius, and his own advancement to the empire*.

On the death of his uncle, Julian marched directly to constantinople, which was the place of his nativity, where he was received without opposition, and where he behaved in such a manner as to acquire great popularity, redressing many public wrongs, and punishing the authors of them; and though he did not conceal his own attachment to heathenism, he behaved at first with the greatest moderation and impartiality towards his christian subjects; and he pleased many of them by recalling from banishment the bishops whom his uncle had capriciously deposed, and restoring them to their sees. He wrote to Basil and Gregory (who will soon make a great figure in this history) with whom he had studied at Athens, in-
viting

*Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 1, p. 177.

them, among other persons of distinguished learning, to his court, but probably to engage them in his designs. This invitation, however, they declined, from an unfavourable opinion they had conceived of him, and especially the marks of levity, inconstancy, and vanity which they had seen in him; indications not of a great, but of a little mind.

Julian gained the applause of many by his reforms in the imperial household, from which he cut off all superfluous expence, by his contempt of all pomp, which however he carried to an extreme that was unbecoming the dignity of an emperor, by his application to study, and the harrangues which he made in the senate, such as no emperor had attempted since the time of Julius Cæsar. His patronage of learned men, and especially the heathen philosophers, brought great numbers of them to his court, especially his tutor Maximus, to whom he behaved with the respect of a child to a father. These men, who were his only associates, contributed not a little to flatter his vanity, which was the predominant foible of his character.

An anecdote which we find in Eunapius*, concerning the manner in which Maximus went to the court of Julian, may give us an idea of the spirit and folly of heathenism. Presently after his arrival at Constantinople, Julian sent messengers to Maximus

* Vita Maximi, p. 77.

Maximus and Chrysanthius, who married the cousin of Eunapius, the writer of this account. They were both at Sardis ; and having much experience in the art of divination, they had recourse to the gods to direct them how to proceed. The omens were so unpromising that Chrysanthius was terrified and discouraged ; but Maximus whose inclination to comply with the flattering request was probably stronger than that of Chrysanthius, said that he had forgotten the rules of their discipline, which they had learned from their childhood which was not to be discouraged by the first repulses, but to use violence with the gods (*ἐνβιάζεσθαι τῷ τευ θεῶν φουρί*) till they obtained their request. Chrysanthius replied that, if he had the courage to persist, he might ; but that for himself, he could not resist the presages they had seen. Maximus, however, persisted, till at length he obtained the omen that he wanted. The remainder of the account I shall give in the words of Mr. Gibbon*, as I might be suspected of wishing to give an unfavourable idea of the boasted philosophy of the heathens.

“ The journey of Maximus through the cities
 “ of Asia displayed the triumph of philosophy
 “ vanity ; and the magistrates vied with each other
 “ in the honourable reception which they prepared
 “ for the friend of their sovereign : Julian was pro-
 “ nouncing

“ nouncing an oration before the senate when he
 “ was informed of the arrival of Maximus. The
 “ emperor immediately interrupted his discourse
 “ advanced to meet him, and after a tender em-
 “ brace conducted him by the hand into the midst
 “ of the assembly, where he publicly acknowledged
 “ the benefits which he had derived from the in-
 “ structions of the philosopher.”

“ Maximus, who soon acquired the confidence;
 “ and influenced the councils, of Julian, was in-
 “ sensibly corrupted by the temptations of a court;
 “ His dress became more splendid, his demeanour
 “ more lofty, and he was exposed under a suc-
 “ ceeding reign to a disgraceful inquiry into the
 “ means by which the disciple of Plato had accu-
 “ mulated, in the short duration of his favour, a
 “ very scandalous proportion of wealth. Of the
 “ other philosophers and sophists who were invit-
 “ ed to the imperial residence by the choice of Ju-
 “ lian, or the success of Maximus, few were able
 “ to preserve their innocence or reputation. The
 “ liberal gifts of money, lands, and houses, were
 “ insufficient to satiate their rapacious avarice; and
 “ the indignation of the people was justly excited
 “ by the remembrance of their abject poverty, and
 “ disinterested professions.”

Julian indulged his vanity in a work which he
 composed, entitled *the Cæsars*, in which he satyri-
 zed all the emperors who had gone before him. He
 also

also wrote several books against the christian religion ; but in them there appeared to be more of wit than of argument*.

Of all the preceding emperors Julian was the greatest admirer of Marcus Antoninus ; and as he resembled him in some of his good qualities, though not in all of them, so he certainly partook of his superstition. That he had this, and other faults, is acknowledged by his best friends. To copy the account which Dr. Lardner, whose impartiality has never been called in question, gives of him, “ he had a certain levity of mind, he was a
 “ great talker, and very fond of fame, superstitious
 “ rather than properly religious, so addicted to sa-
 “ crificing, that it was said the race of bulls would
 “ be destroyed if he returned victorious from Per-
 “ sia ; and such was the multitude of his victims,
 “ that his soldiers who partook of them were of-
 “ ten much disordered by excess in eating and
 “ drinking. So Ammianus. It would be tedious
 “ to rehearse all the instances of excessive, and even
 “ ridiculous superstition, which may be found in
 “ heathen writers.

“ Libanius says he received the rising sun with
 “ blood, and attended him again with blood at
 “ his sitting ; and because he could not go abroad
 “ so often as he would, he made a temple of his
 “ palace, and placed altars in his garden, which
 was

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 1, 167, &c.

" was purer than most chapels. By frequent
 " devotions he engaged the gods to be his
 " auxiliaries, in war, worshipping Mercury, Ceres,
 " Mars, Calliope, Apollo, and Jupiter, whom
 " he worshipped in his temple upon the hill,
 " and in the city, meaning Antioch. Com-
 " plaining of the gods who had deserted him,
 " Whom shall we blame, says Libanius, not one,
 " but all ; for none were neglected by him, nei-
 " ther gods nor goddesses. And is this the return,
 " says he, for all his victims, for all his vows, for
 " all the incense, and all the blood offered up to
 " them, by day and by night. Again, says the
 " same writer, wherever there was a temple,
 " whether in the city or on the hill, or on the tops
 " of the mountains, no place was so rough, or so
 " difficult of access, but he ran to it as if the way
 " had been smooth and pleasant, if it had a temple,
 " or even had had one.

" But though Julian was so devout and re-
 " ligious in his way, when he was disappointed, he
 " could be displeased, and even angry with his
 " gods, like other heathen people, especially the
 " vulgar among them. In the Persian war, hav-
 " ing had some advantages, and expecting more,
 " he prepared a grand sacrifice for Mars ; but the
 " omens not being favourable he was exceedingly
 " moved, and called Jupiter to witness, that he
 " would never more offer a sacrifice to Mars.

“ This excess of superstition, it seems to me, is an
 “ argument of want of judgment, which defect ap-
 “ peared upon divers occasions, and in many ac-
 “ tions not altogether becoming the dignity of an
 “ emperor*.”

Julian was heard to declare that if he could render each individual richer than Midas, and every city greater than Babylon, he should not esteem himself the benefactor of mankind, unless at the same time, he could reclaim his subjects from their impious revolt against the immortal gods†.

S E C T I O N III.

Instances of Julian's Partiality for the Heathens, and his Prejudice against the Christians.

NOTWITHSTANDING the professed moderation of Julian, the difference of his behaviour towards the heathens and christians, in similar circumstances, was sufficiently striking as will appear from the following examples.

There

* Testimonies, Vol. iv. p. 25.

† Gibbon's Hist. Vol. ii, p. 379.

SECT. III. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 227

There was in the city of Alexandria a place in which the heathen priests had been used to offer human sacrifices. This place, as being of no use, Constantius gave to the church of Alexandria, and George the bishop gave orders for it to be cleared, in order to build a christian church on the spot. In doing this they discovered an immense subterraneous cavern, in which the heathen mysteries had been performed, and in it were human skulls. These, and other things, which they found in the place, the christians brought out, and exposed to public ridicule. The heathens, provoked at this exhibition, suddenly took arms, and rushing upon the christians, killed many of them with swords, clubs, and stones : some they strangled, and several they crucified.

On this the christians proceeded no farther in clearing the temple ; but the heathens, pursuing their advantage, seized the bishop as he was in the church, and put him in prison. The next day they dispatched him, and then fastening the body to a camel, he was dragged about the streets all day, and in the evening they burnt him and the camel together. This fate, Sozomen says, the bishop owed in part to his haughtiness while he was in favour with Constantius, and some say the friends of Athanasius were concerned in this massacre ; but he ascribes it chiefly to the inveteracy of the heathens, whose superstitions he had been
very

very active in abolishing. Had any christians been concerned in it, he justly observes that Julian would have triumphed in the circumstance, and not have reproached the pagans with it as he did.

When the emperor was informed of these shocking outrages and cruelties, he neither ordered any enquiry to be made after the authors of them, nor expressed a wish to punish any person whatever; but contented himself with writing them a letter of reproof, acknowledging that the christians had deserved all that they had suffered, and even more; but asking them if they were not ashamed to tear a man to pieces like so many dogs, and then lift up their hands in prayer to the gods, as if they were pure. They ought, he says, to have had recourse to the laws when they thought themselves injured, and that they were happy in having an emperor who would apply no other remedy to their disorders besides reproof and exhortation, which he hoped they would respect the more, as they were Greeks. He then says that he forgave them for the sake of their god Serapis, Alexander the founder of their city, and his uncle Julian, who was præfect of Egypt and Alexandria, extremely addicted to heathen superstition, and a promoter of the persecution of the christians, beyond the orders of his master*. This

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 23, p. 173. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 7, p. 189.

This George the Arian bishop of Alexandria, was a man of letters, and had a very valuable library, which Julian ordered to be seized for his own use; and in his orders concerning it, he says that many of the books were on philosophical and rhetorical subjects, though many of them related to the doctrine of the *impious Galileans* (as in his sneering contemptuous way he always affected to call the christians) "These books," says he, "I could wish to have utterly destroyed; but lest books of value should be destroyed along with them, let these also be carefully sought for." He says that he himself was not unacquainted with the books of this bishop, for that when he was in Capadocia he had borrowed some of them, to have them transcribed, and then returned them again. On this occasion Lardner justly observes, that it was a mean thing in this emperor, and below a philosopher, to wish that christian writings should be destroyed*. I would add, that it does not appear that any price was to be given for these books to the family of the proprietor of them.

Such was the forbearance of Julian towards the heathens. Let us now see on what slight pretences he banished some christian bishops, as Athanasius of Alexandria, Eleusius of Cyzicum, and Titus of Bostira, all men of great distinction, as Lardner

* Testimonies, Vol. iv. p. 98.

ner observes, whose extracts from Sozomen on this subject I shall quote or abridge.

“ Julian, hearing that Athanasius, who had succeeded to the church of Alexandria after the death of George, above mentioned, boldly taught the people, and brought over many Gentiles to christianity, ordered him to leave the place, and threatened him with a severe penalty if he did not. Though the emperor, says this writer was determined by all means to restore heathenism, he judged it imprudent to compel men by punishments to sacrifice against their will. Nevertheless he banished the clergy out of cities, intending by their absence to abolish the assemblies of the people, when there were none to teach them and perform the accustomed rites, that in length of time the memory of their worship might be lost. His pretence for so doing was that the clergy excited the people to sedition. Under this pretence he banished Eleusius and his friends from Cyzicum, though there

* *Ecditius* the præfect of Egypt, delaying to carry his orders into execution, Julian wrote to him as follows : “ Though you neglect to write to me on any other subject, at least it is your duty to inform me of your conduct towards Athanasius, the enemy of the Gods. My intentions have been long since communicated to you. I swear by the great Serapis, that unless, on the calends of December, Athanasius has de-

was

“ was no sedition there, nor any reason to apprehend it.

“ He also required that the people of Bosra should, by a public decree, expel from their city their bishop Titus ; because when he had threatened that if there was any disturbance in that place he should impute it to the bishop and his clergy. Titus had sent a letter to the emperor, assuring him that the christians in Bosra were equal in number to the Gentiles, that they were very peaceable, and that paying a regard to his admonitions, they had no thought of making any disturbance. From these words Julian took occasion to write a letter to the people of Bosra, in order to incense them.

“ parted from Alexandria, nay, from Egypt, the officers of your government shall pay a fine of one hundred pounds of gold. You know my temper. I am slow to condemn, but still slower to forgive.” This epistle was enforced by a short postscript, written with the emperor’s own hand. “ The contempt that is shewn for all the gods fills me with grief and indignation. There is nothing that I should see, nothing that I should hear, with more pleasure, than the expulsion of Athanasius from all Egypt. The abominable wretch. Under my reign, the baptism of several Grecian Ladies, of the highest rank, has been the effect of his persecutions.” Gibbon’s History, Vol. ii, p. 408.

“ against

“ against Titus, as having accused them, by
 “ intimating that it was not owing to their
 “ good temper, but to his exhortations, that
 “ they were kept from sedition, though the let-
 “ ter was far from admitting any such construc-
 “ tion. On this pretence, however, he excited
 “ the people to expel the bishop, as a public
 “ enemy.

“ The like happened in many other places,
 “ partly owing to the command of the empe-
 “ ror, and partly to the violence and petulance
 “ of the people ; but the whole fault, says the bis-
 “ torian, is to be ascribed to the emperor himself,
 “ who neglected to punish according to the laws,
 “ those who, out of hatred to our religion, tran-
 “ gressed in these respects, seemingly reproving
 “ them in words, but by actions really exciting
 “ them to such irregularities.*”

* Lardner's Testimonies, Vol, iv. p. 109.

SECTION IV.

Julian's Artifices to subvert Christianity, and his Testimony in favour of it.

THE whole of Julian's conduct clearly shews that in his restoration of the bishops to the sees from which they had been expelled, which had the appearance of justice and moderation, his real design was to promote dissensions in the churches, by the contests which would necessarily arise between the bishops who were recalled, and those who had obtained possession of their sees, to prevent which he had made no provision whatever. In consequence of this order, however, Meletius returned to Antioch*, Athanasius to Alexandria, Hilary to Gaul, Lucifer to Sardinia, both from Thebais, and Eusebius to Italy. But the consequence of this was, what no doubt Julian rejoiced in great dissensions in the churches to which they returned, especially at Antioch, where the different factions did not cease for eighty years.

VOL. II.

F f

Among

* Constantius being displeased with Meletius, because, contrary to his expectations, he found him to be an advocate for the Homoeousian doctrine, sent him to Meletina his native place, and put Euzoius into his see; Philostorgii Hist. Lib. v, Cap. 5, p. 509.

Among others he restored Aetius, writing him a friendly letter, inviting him to come to him, and defraying the expences of his journey. He not only favoured the Novatians, but obliged Eleusinus bishop of Cyzicum to rebuild at his own expence, and within the short space of two months, a church of that sect which he had been the means of destroying in the time of Constantius. This was justice, no doubt, but administered in a capricious manner, and not with a view to answer the proper ends of justice, which is to promote the peace of society*.

Julian also gave leave to the Donatists to hold their assemblies as usual; and having been grievously oppressed by the Catholics, they are said by Optatus†, to have taken ample revenge for their past injuries; but the violences which he describes as committed by them on this occasion can hardly be credited.

Among other methods which Julian took to establish heathenism he endeavoured to make the heathens adopt those customs to which he thought the great credit and flourishing state of christians, were chiefly owing. But nothing of the kind having ever been attempted before, his scheme was unnatural and ineffectual. With this view, however

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 4, 5, p. 125, &c. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 5, p. 187.

† Lib. vi. p. 111, &c.

however, he ordered that the heathen temples should be furnished, like the christian churches, with seats for persons of different classes; and he appointed readers and preachers, to give regular lectures on certain days and hours. He also provided places of retreat, like monasteries for those who chose to spend their lives in philosophical speculation, and other places for the reception of poor people and strangers; and he established rules of penance for offences voluntary and involuntary. But what he particularly admired among the christians were the tickets which they gave to those who travelled, to ensure them a friendly reception wherever they went.

A letter which he wrote to Arfacius, high priest of Galatia, shews both his solicitude upon this subject, and how hopeless his project was. I shall therefore give a considerable part of it, sometimes using the translation of Dr. Lardner.

“ If Hellenism does not prosper according to
 “ our wish, it is the fault of those who profess it.
 “ With respect to the religion itself, there is noth-
 “ ing wanting in point of excellence or magnifi-
 “ cence, and so great a change has taken place in
 “ favour of it as far exceeds our utmost expectati-
 “ ons. But this will not suffice without attending
 “ to the circumstances which have contributed to
 “ the increale of Atheism,” (meaning christianity)
 “ such as their humanity to strangers, the care
 “ they

“ they take about burying their dead, and their
 “ affected gravity of manners, each of which we
 “ ought to adopt. Nor is it enough that you a-
 “ lone act in this manner, but all the inferior
 “ priests in Galatia, whom you must, by shame, or
 “ persuasion, bring into this method, or remove
 “ them from the sacerdotal office. Their wives,
 “ children, and servants, must come to the wor-
 “ ship of the gods, and must forbear to con-
 “ verse with the servants, children, and wives of the
 “ Galileans, who are impious towards the gods,
 “ and prefer impiety to religion. You are like-
 “ wise to order them not to frequent the theatre,
 “ nor to drink in taverns, nor to exercise any mean
 “ and sordid employments. Such as hearken to
 “ your directions you are to encourage, others you
 “ are to reject.

“ You must also erect hospitals in every city,
 “ that strangers also may share in your humanity.
 “ As to the expence, I have already provided for it ;
 “ having ordered thirty thousand (modii) pecks of
 “ wheat, and sixty thousand (ξέσας) pints of wine
 “ to be given every year for the whole province of
 “ Galatia, a fifth part of which I would have giv-
 “ en to those poor persons who attend upon the
 “ priests, and the rest to strangers and beggars. For
 “ it is a shame that when there are no beggars a-
 “ mong the Jews, and the impious Galileans
 “ relieve not only their own people, but ours also,
 our

SECT. IV. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 237

“ our poor should be neglected by us, and be left
“ helpless and destitute. Teach the Gentiles,
“ therefore, that they contribute something to this
“ service, and that the villagers offer their first
“ fruits to the gods ; and shew them that this
“ has been an ancient custom among the Greeks,
“ as we may see in Homer.

“ Very rarely visit the civil governors at their
“ houses, but rather write to them. When they
“ enter a city, let no priest go out to meet them,
“ When they enter the temples of the gods, let no
“ priest go farther than the vestibule to wait upon
“ them. When they enter the temples, let none
“ of their guards go before them, but let them fol-
“ low if they please : for as soon as any person pas-
“ ses the threshold of the temple, he is to be con-
“ sidered as no other than a private person. You
“ know very well that within the temple you your-
“ self hold the highest rank, as the divine law re-
“ quires. They who submit to this regulation,
“ are indeed pious worshippers of the gods, but
“ they who carry their pride and pomp along with
“ them are vain-glorious persons.

“ I am very willing to relieve the people of
“ Pessinum if they will first appease the mother
“ of the gods ; but if they neglect her they will not
“ only be reprov'd, but, what I am sorry to add,
“ shall feel my indignation, for” quoting two Greek
verses, “ we must have no compassion upon, or
“ shew

“ shew any favour to those who are the enemies of
 “ the immortal gods. Assure them, therefore, that
 “ if they expect any favour from me, they must
 “ all worship the mother of the gods*.”

In this letter it is easy to perceive the spirit of a persecutor, and that Julian would have done as much as Diocletian and his colleagues, if he could have attempted it with safety to himself, and with any prospect of success. But it is more pleasing to observe in it the traces of some excellent christian customs of this age, such as the gravity and decency of their manners, especially those of the clergy, who paid no servile court to the civil governors, their care to avoid the theatre and the taverns ; their charity, which was not confined to themselves, but extended even to the heathens, their reverence for their religion, and for their places of public worship, so that a magistrate was considered as no other than a private person when he was there.

How strange must all this exhortation to moral duties have appeared to the priests and professors of heathenism, whose religion never had, or could possibly have, any connexion, with moral virtue, and the chief recommendation of which to the common people were the riotous and licentious festivals which it provided for them, and the promises it held out to them of enabling them to pry into futurity. As to moral instruction the duties

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Chap. 16, p. 203.

ties of mutual affection, and extensive charity, the attempt to graft them upon heathenism (in which the doctrine of one God, of his moral government, and a future state of retribution was unknown) must have appeared ridiculous to the heathens themselves.

If the things which Julian recommends in this letter (and of which he himself would have had no idea, if he had not seen them among christians) had had any natural connexion with heathenism, it would have appeared long before, even before the appearance of christianity. On the contrary, the religious rites of the Greeks and Romans had such an evident tendency to debase the minds, and to corrupt the morals of men, that about the time of our Saviour the philosophers began to be ashamed of them : and the zeal that we afterwards find for them in such men as Marcus Antoninus, Julian, and the heathen philosophers of his age, arose from their having nothing else to oppose to christianity, and to prevent its spreading among the common people. With respect to these, Julian did not take the right method to gain them. Some new and more diverting spectacle, some refinement in sensual gratification, or some improvement in the art of divination, might have been attended to ; but moral lectures, of piety, and virtue, had no charms for them ; otherwise, they would have become christians.

Julian

Julian was very sensible that an open persecution of christians, if he could have undertaken it with safety to himself (which in his situation, and especially at the beginning of his reign, he certainly could not) would have been ineffectual. But it is evident from his whole conduct, that there was nothing nearer his heart than to undermine christianity by degrees, and to extirpate it altogether if possible. This scheme, and his preparation for the Persian war, occupied him intirely. Far, indeed, was Julian from being the philosopher that he first affected to be, in leaving religion free to all his subjects without preferring, or molesting, any person on that account. If ever there was a bigot to the rites of heathenism, and a malignant one with respect to christianity, it was Julian, who appears in so respectable a light to many modern unbelievers.

S E C.

S E C T I O N V.

Julian's more direct Attempts to undermine, and gradually to extirpate, Christianity.

JULIAN, as has been seen already, was continually sacrificing, and encouraging others to do it. He took from the christian clergy and their churches, all the privileges and grants of his predecessors. He restored to the heathen priests, of every class, their former honours and immunities; enforcing, however, that superstitious abstinence from certain meats, which had been prescribed to some of the classes of them; and he gave back to the temples their former revenues. The Nilometer, which, by order of Constantine, had been kept in a christian church, he removed to the temple of Serapis.

He was frequently writing to the cities which were most addicted to the heathen rites, encouraging them to ask any favours of him, and shewing the greatest readiness to grant them. But he had such an aversion to those cities in which christianity was generally professed, that he would not so much as hear their complaints. Though the people of Nisibis were particularly exposed to the ir-

ruptions of the Persians, on the approach of the war, he would not receive their ambassadors, and said he should send them no succours, because they were all christians. He considered their city as a polluted place and said that he would never set his foot in it unless they returned to the heathen religion.

Such was this philosophical emperor, the common father of all his subjects. Julian had the same objection to the people of Constantia, because they were all christians, and annexed the place to the city of Gaza, to which it was a sea port, though Constantine had given it the privileges of an independent city; and there was no reason for the change in favour of Gaza, but that the inhabitants of this place were generally heathens.*

He likewise struck Cæsarea, the metropolis of Cappadocia, out of the list of cities, and changed its name, because almost all the inhabitants were christians, and had demolished the temples of Jupiter and Apollo. Hearing that they had proceeded to demolish the only temple that remained in the place after his accession to the empire, he was provoked to the highest degree, and reproached the heathen inhabitants, though they were very few in number, for not exerting themselves to prevent it.

Julian

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 2. p, 182.

Julian ordered the strictest inquiry to be made into all estates belonging to christian churches, in order to confiscate the whole of them, and he did not scruple to make use of torture to come at the truth, which was a most cruel persecution under another name. He subjected all the christian clergy to the lowest services in the army, and he made the common people in the cities to pay the same tax that was exacted in the villages. He threatened that unless the christians rebuilt the temples he would never cease till he had destroyed the places in which they had stood, and used to add, that he would not even suffer the Galileans to wear their heads. Our historian justly observes, that if it had been in his power, and he had not been prevented by death, he would probably have been as good as his word*.

Though Julian forbore to persecute unto death, he could not on several occasions, refrain from using insults, which sufficiently shewed what he *felt*, and what he wished to do. When he was sacrificing in a temple at Constantinople, and Maris the bishop of Chalcedon, a man respectable for his learning, and the part that he had acted in public life, and now for his age, was coming that way, he abused him as an impious person, and an enemy of the gods. He had even the meanness to reproach him for his blindness, saying, " Will not
" your

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 4, p. 184.

“ your Galilean God cure you.” The old man replied, “ I thank my God that I am deprived of sight, that I may not see your fall from piety.” On this occasion the emperor had so much command of himself, as to pass on without making any answer*.

Notwithstanding Julian’s affectation of great magnanimity, he was not always so much master of himself as he appeared to be on this occasion, which indeed was at the beginning of his reign. When he was at Antioch, a little before he set out on his expedition against Persia, two of the officers who attended upon his person, Juventinus and Maximus, complained that, by his orders, every thing in the city was polluted with the rites of heathenism, so that the very fountains which supplied the city, and every thing that was sold in the market, bread, flesh meat, herbs, apples, &c. had been sprinkled with lustral water, by which it was, as it were consecrated to the heathen gods : for such had been his insidious policy, in order to draw the people insensibly into idolatry.

Julian hearing of their having made these complaints, ordered them to be brought before him ; and as, by his manner of interrogating them (in which, as his custom was, he affected great familiarity) he encouraged them to speak freely, they told him that they *had* made those complaints ; and that

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v, Cap. 4 185;

that having been educated in the christian religion, under his predecessors Constantine and Constantius, they could not help being disgusted at seeing every thing contaminated with the rites of heathenism ; but that this was the only thing of which they complained in his reign. At this he was so provoked, that he ordered them to be put to death with torture, pretending that it was not on account of their religion, but for their petulance in insulting their emperor. However, the christian citizens of Antioch justly considered them as martyrs, providing for them a splendid monument, and observing an annual festival for them*.

About the same time a deaconness, of the name of Pythia, a leader of a choir of women, having sung psalms as the emperor was passing by the doors of a church, and having, imprudently perhaps, made choice of those psalms in which the heathen gods and their worshippers are spoken of with contempt, he was so provoked, that he sent for her; and though she was very old, one of his guards struck her by his orders on both the cheeks, in his presence, till the blood came out†.

When Valentinian, who was afterwards emperor, but then only a tribune, was walking before Julian into a heathen temple, in the early part of his reign, he struck the priest, who either casually,
or

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 15, p. 134.

† Ibid. Cap. 19. p. 138.

or as he probably thought, intentionally, sprinkled him as well as the emperor, with the lustral water, as thinking himself defiled by it. But the emperor was so offended at the liberty which he took, that he banished him to a castle situated in a desert place*.

Julian withdrew from the churches that allowance from the public funds which Constantine had granted for the relief of the poor and the widows. He moreover took from the churches all their sacred vessels, and others things of value that had been presented to them, and wherever the temples had been destroyed, he compelled the christians to rebuild them; and when they were unable to do this, he punished them with imprisonment and torture, without excepting the bishops and clergy; so that, in this form, our historian says, the persecution was in reality not much less grievous than it had been under the heathen emperor†.

Julian was more particularly intent on banishing all christians from the army. For this purpose he removed the sign of the cross from the standards, and in the statues which were made for him he gave orders that a figure of some of the heathen gods should accompany them. For example Jupiter was drawn as descending from heaven,

* Theod. Cap. 16, p. 150.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 5, p. 186.

ven, and presenting him with his own crown and purple robe, the ensigns of imperial power, of Mars or Mercury, smiling upon him, the former as a warrior, and the latter as an orator. This he did that those who paid homage to his statues might at the same time be obliged to pay their respects to those heathen gods. If they refused to do it, he punished their neglect, as an offence against himself.

In order to deceive the soldiers into the act of sacrificing, he refused to give them the usual donative on festival days, unless according to the ancient custom of the Romans, they threw some frankincense into the fire. This some of them incautiously did; but others who were apprized of the nature of the action, refused the donative on those terms; and informing the others that they had been guilty of an act of idolatry, they were so much shocked at what they had done, that they ran about the streets, declaring that they were christians, and had always been so. They even went to the emperor, and returned the donative, telling him that they were ready to die for Christ if he ordered it. But he contented himself with dismissing them from the service*.

At one time, however, the clamour of some of these penitent soldiers to be led to martyrdom, rather than be thus betrayed into idolatry, provoked

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Chap. 17, p. 205.

ed the emperor so much, that he ordered them to be beheaded. Accordingly, they were conducted to a place without the city, to which they were followed by a great croud of people, admiring and praising their fortitude, as had always been usual on such occasions. Being arrived at the place of punishment, the oldest among them desired the executioner to begin with the youngest, lest he should be terrified at seeing others put to death before him. Accordingly the youngest of them was placed on his knees, and the executioner was preparing to do his office, when the emperor sent to recal his order. But the young man was so far from rejoicing at his deliverance, that he said, "Romanus," for such was his name, "was not worthy to be a martyr." This lenity of Julian, the historian observes, was not spontaneous; but he envied the christians the glory of their martyrs. However his banishing many of them from the cities into the extreme parts of the empire would, in many cases, be a punishment worse than death*.

Farther to discourage the profession of christianity, he took from those who refused to sacrifice the rights of citizens. He even forbade them all access to the public Forum, and other places of general concourse, and excluded them from all magistracies and honours, especially from the government

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 17. p. 186.

ment of provinces ; alledging in his insulting manner (which is certainly no indication of a great mind, and which shews how little he was acquainted with christianity, or how willing he was to pervert it) that their religion forbade the use of the sword for the purpose of capital punishment*.

But the most illiberal of all the methods that Julian took to lower the credit, and prevent the spread of christianity; a measure exclaimed against by the heathens themselves, was that he would not allow the christians to teach the Greek poets and orators. He was exceedingly mortified to observe how many christians there were, both Catholics and Arians, who distinguished themselves as men of letters; that Apollinaris the Syrian was so eminent in every kind of science, and particularly that Basil and Gregory of Cappadocia, who had studied along with him at Athens, should excel all the orators of their age ; and thinking that they derived their great power of persuasion from their study of the Greek orators, he wished to deprive them of that advantage. As a reason for his conduct, he charged the christians with inconsistency in teaching what they did not believe, and that it was absurd in them to give lessons out of Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, and Lyfias, and at the same time revile the gods

VOL. II.

H h

whom

* Socratis. Hist Lib. iii, Cap: 13, p. 138.

whom those writers had worshipped. "If they think those books contain a false religion, let them go," says he, "to the churches of the Galileans, and there study Matthew and Luke*." But if Julian had thought that there had been that necessary connection between the *religion* of the classic writers, and the excellence of their *style*, it would have been wiser in him to have encouraged the christians in the use of them, as a means of drawing them to the heathen religion. In him it was a low and unworthy insult.

This prohibition, from which Julian expected so much, was far from answering his purpose. Orosius says, that when he published his edict forbidding the christian professors of rhetoric to teach the liberal arts, they almost all chose to resign their chairs; and Jerom says, that Proæresius, the Athenian sophist shut up his school, though the emperor had granted him a special licence to teach. Austin records the like steadiness of Victorinus, who had long taught rhetoric with great applause at Rome. But Ecebolius, a christian sophist at Constantinople, who had been Julian's master in rhetoric, was overcome by the temptations of the times, and openly professed heathenism. However, when Julian was dead, he recovered himself, and

* Juliani Epist. xlii. Opera. Vol. I. p. 422

and with much humility, intreated to be reconciled to the church*.

In some measure to remedy the disadvantage arising from their not having access to the Grecian poets and orators, learned christians applied themselves to write such books as might in part supply the want of those which had been usually read in the schools. Particularly, Apollinaris the elder wrote in heroic verse the history of the bible, as far as the reign of Saul, divided, like the Iliad, into twenty four books. He wrote comedies like those of Menander, tragedies like those of Euripides, and lyric poems like those of Pindar, and also works of every other kind, not inferior, in the opinion of christians of that age, to those of the Grecian masters. He likewise wrote an excellent work concerning *Truth*, against the heathen philosophers, in which he shewed, by other arguments than those which are drawn from the scriptures, that they were mistaken in what they taught concerning God†.

The younger Appollinaris wrote the history of Christ, and of the apostles in the form of dialogues, like those of Plato ; and about this time also Heliodorus composed an elegant and ingenious romance called *Ethiopics*, which has served as a model

* Lardner's Testimonies, Vol. iv. p. 41.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v, Cap. 18, p. 207.

del for other works of the kind. As soon, however, as, upon the death of Julian, christians were at liberty to teach what books they pleased, all these compositions of christianity were laid aside, and the study of the Greek classics was resumed, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of some pious christians against the practice.*

SECTION. VI.

Violences committed upon Christians in the Reign of Julian.

THAT Julian had as great a hatred of christianity as any of the persecuting emperors, and that he would have used any means that he could have thought would be effectual to extirpate it, cannot be doubted ; and there were persons enow to second his views, and even go beyond his orders, indulging that brutal spirit with which the heathens in general, and especially those of the lower classes, were always actuated against the christians. Indeed, notwithstanding the boasted lenity

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 16, p. 791.

lenity of Julian, there were many who were properly martyrs to their religion in his reign. Theodoret says that an account of the outrages committed by the heathens upon the christians, while Julian was emperor would require a separate volume, and that he therefore confines himself to a few of the cases.

At Ascalon and Gaza, the heathen populace, without any orders from the emperor, but hoping to escape unpunished for doing what they conceived would not be disagreeable to him, indulged their brutal disposition so far as to put to death several priests and nuns. It is even said that they ripped open their bellies, and throwing barley upon the bowels, exposed them to be torn by hogs.

The same shocking outrage was committed by the inhabitants of Heliopolis near mount Libanus, upon some nuns of that place, after exposing them naked in the public streets, and subjecting them to all kinds of insults. They were provoked to this particular kind of outrage, because they had been prohibited from prostituting their young women, according to their ancient custom, in the precincts of the temple, before marriage; a rite of heathenism which is particularly described by Herodotus, as practised in his time, at Babylon. For Constantius had demolished the celebrated temple of Venus in that place, and building a christian church

church there, had prohibiteed the former prostitution*.

At the same city of Heliopolis there was one Cyril a deacon, who in the preceding reign had been particularly active in demolishing the temple. The heathens, not forgetting this, took advantage of the present times not only to kill the man, but it is said that they even tore and tasted his liver. The history of the former persecutions, and the brutal disposition of the lower class of idolaters, will make this part of the story not incredible, though no regard is due to what is subjoined by the christian writers, of the judgment of God upon these inhuman murderers, of their teeth falling out, and their tongues corrupting, &c. The fact, of the murder being true, the superstition of the age would easily add the rest.

At Dorostolum, a city of Thrace, Æmilianus was burned alive, on what pretence is not said, by the order of Capitolinus the præfect. At Arethusa in Syria one Mark, who in the time of Constantius had shewn much zeal in destroying the heathen temples, and building christian churches with their materials, was seized by the inhabitants of the place, after he had first fled, but afterwards surrendered himself; and though he was an old man, they first scourged him naked, then dragged him through the

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 10, p. 194.

the common fever and anointing him with honey and some kind of pickle, suspended him in the sun to be tormented with wasps and other insects. This they did in order to extort from him money to repair their temples. But finding that, though he was pricked with styles, as well as tormented with insects, he refused to give any thing for such a purpose, they dismissed him ; and, admiring his constancy, many of them were afterwards converted to christianity*.

At Merum in Phrygia the præfect Amalchius ordered a heathen temple to be cleared, and the image that was in it to be repaired ; which gave such offence to three zealous christians, Macedonius, Theodulus, and Tatian, that they went in the night. and broke the image. When the governor was going to punish the innocent inhabitants of the place, they confessed what they had done, and refusing to sacrifice (on which their lives would have been spared) they were exposed to all kinds of torture, and at length put upon a grid-iron and roasted before a slow fire ; but even in this situation they made light of their torments†.

At

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 7, p. 128. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. γ. Cap. 10, p. 194. i

† Socratis Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 15, p. 190. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 11, p. 196.

At the same time Busris of Ancyra in Galatia, who was of the sect of the Encratites, having insulted the heathens was seized by the governor of the province, and being placed upon the engine of torture, he held up his own hands, and exposed his sides to be torn; saying, there was no occasion to fasten him, and without changing his posture, he bore all the pain they could put him to. He was then sent to prison; but being released after the death of Julian, he lived to the reign of Theodosius, and joined the catholic church.

At the same time Basil, a presbyter of the church of Ancyra, and Euphychius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, suffered martyrdom, the latter being a man of an honourable family, and just married. They were among those who had demolished the heathen temple in that place, which gave such extreme offence to Julian, that all who were concerned in it were punished with death or banishment. Basil had been particularly zealous in exhorting the people not to sacrifice, but to adhere to their religion, without regarding any thing that they might be called to suffer. This he did at a time of public sacrifice, and being seized by the president, he bore torture with great constancy before he expired. These facts, as the historian justly observes, shew that there were many martyrs in this
reign

reign though no orders had been given to punish christians, as such, with death*.

At Gaza the heathen inhabitants who, as has been observed, were much more numerous than the christians, seized upon Eusebius, Nestabus, and Zeno, who in the preceding reign had demolished their temples, and insulted their religion; and having first scourged, and then imprisoned them, they afterwards dragged them along the pavement, with their faces sometimes upwards and sometimes downwards, beating them with stones, clubs and other things. The women ran out of their houses, and some poured boiling water upon them, and others thrust spits, &c. into them; and when they had mangled them in this manner, they took them to a place without the city, where the carcases of beasts were usually thrown, and burning them, mixed their bones with those of camels and asses.

Zeno their cousin, having collected their bones, narrowly escaped being seized, and fled to Anthedon, a place on the sea coast, about twenty stadia from Gaza. The heathen inhabitants of this place discovering him, scourged him, and turned him out of the city. He then took refuge in Constantia, the inhabitants of which as has been observed, were christians, and there he was concealed till the

danger was over. In the reign of Theodosius this Zeno became the bishop of the place, and building a church without the city, he deposited in it the remains of his cousins above mentioned, together with those of Nestor, another of them, who had been seized and scourged at the same time, and left for dead, and who afterwards died of his bruises in the house of Zeno.

For these shocking violences Julian did not even reprove the people of Gaza by a letter, as he had done the citizens of Alexandria. Nay he displaced the governor of the province, for having seized some of the persons concerned in these outrages, in order to their trial ; saying, there was no occasion for that, when they had only revenged themselves upon a few Galileans, for the many injuries they had done to them and their gods. Hilario, a monk of Gaza escaped death by flying first to Sicily, then to Dalmatia, and lastly to Cyprus*.

Lastly, Julian himself not only confiscated the property of Artemius, who had been the military commander in Egypt in the time of Constantius, and had been active in breaking the images, but ordered him to be beheaded. This, says Theodoret, was done by that prince, whose clemency
and

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 9, 10, p. 191, 193.

and freedom from anger, his admirers so much extol*.

Julian's aversion to christianity was so great that, in opposition to it, he patronized the Jews; whose religion he no more respected than that of the christians, but whose enmity to them was equal to his own. There is a letter of his still extant inscribed to the community of the Jews, in which he boasts of his having abolished some taxes which had been laid upon them, and calls thier venerable patriarch his brother. He also intreats their prayers for him, that when he shall be returned victorious from the Persian war, he may rebuild the holy city Jerusalem, which for a long time they had earnestly desired to see inhabited; and that he might come and dwell there himself, and together with them offer up prayers to the supreme deity†.

It is also said that Julian, having inquired of some Jews why they did not sacrifice according to the law, they told him that this could only be done at the temple of Jerusalem, which was destroyed, and that on this account, as also with a view to defeat the predictions of our Saviour, he gave orders for rebuilding their temple at his own expence. With this encouragement it is also said, that

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 18. p. 137.

† Lardner's Testimonies, Vol. iv, p. 47.

that the Jews began the work, but that they were prevented by an earthquake, and various miracles, the particulars of which I shall not recite because they are evidently fabulous*.

That Julian once intended to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem is highly probable; from his well known hatred of christianity, and the levity of his temper; but that he seriously entered upon a work of this magnitude, and that he actually contributed any thing towards the expence of it on the eve of a Persian war, is not probable; and his death prevented whatever he might have intended to do after this. As to the Jews, encouraged as they were by the emperor, they would naturally think of the scheme, and would probably be laying some plan for carrying it into execution; but such an undertaking required more time than the reign of Julian to do much more than confer about it.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 20 p. 196. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 22, p. 213. Theodoret, Lib. iii, Cap. 20, p. 139. See Lardner's Testimonies, Vol. iv. p. 46 &c.

SECTION VII.

Of Julian's Expedition against Persia, and his Death.

IN December, A. D. 361, Julian arrived at Constantinople after the death of Constantius; there he staid about eight months, and setting out for Antioch, in his way to Persia, he arrived at that city in July, A. D. 362. In the beginning of March following he proceeded towards Persia, but was slain in battle on the 6th of June. This is the general outline of the history of Julian after he became emperor. Let us now attend to some particulars of his progress towards the East.

Having collected a large sum of money, chiefly by his exactions upon christians, he entered upon his expedition; and when he came to Antioch, being apprehensive that the price of provisions would be advanced in consequence of his presence and that of his army, he very imprudently not only fixed the price of all the necessaries of life, but so low that the people of the neighbourhood did not think it worth their while to supply the market. What the people of Antioch suffered in consequence

quence of this, provoked them to make very free with their master ; and as some of them were of a satyrical turn, they ridiculed him, and especially his beard, saying it ought to be shorn, that ropes might be made of it, &c. He wore his beard, choosing to appear in the character of a philosopher, as well as that of an emperor. And as, out of his great attachment to heathenism, he had ordered that upon his coins there should be drawn an altar and a bull ready to be sacrificed, they had said that this bull would tear up the whole world.

At such jokes as these the emperor was so irritated, that he threatened to leave the place, and go to Tarsus. But dropping this mode of revenge, and confiding in his own talent as a writer, he returned their jokes upon him, by others upon them, in a piece which he entitled *Misopogon* ; a thing certainly unworthy of the dignity of an emperor, especially when engaged in so serious an expedition as that against the Persians always was to the Romans.

Julian, being arrived at Antioch, was much disappointed, and chagrined, to find that the worship of Apollo at Daphne in the neighbourhood of that city, had been so much neglected. He called the great sun to witness, that the condition in which he found the very image of the god, was
such

such as to shew that he had quitted the temple some time before. He had hasted to the place, he says, in expectation of seeing a most splendid worship, victims, libations, dances, &c. but on entering the temple he found neither incense, sacred cake, nor victim. He still thought that these things might be in some place out of the temple, and that they had waited for his coming, as for the high priest. But when he enquired of the priest of the place what sacrifices the city prepared for that great festival, he was answered that the city provided nothing of the kind, but that he himself had furnished a goose for the solemnity*. We may easily imagine what must have been the mortification of Julian to find the progress that christians had now made in the extirpation of heathenism.

Being, however near this famous temple at Daphne, Julian sent to consult the god about the success of his expedition; but no answer being returned, and it being supposed that the body of Babylas the martyr (which had been buried in a place adjoining to the oracle) was the cause of this silence, he ordered it to be removed. This order the christians readily obeyed; and marching in solemn procession, with a great company of women and children, they conveyed the coffin

* Julian's Misopogon, Ópera Vol. i, p. 361, &c.

into the town, singing psalms all the way, and especially those in which the heathen gods and their worshippers were inveighed against, as Ps. xcvi. 7. *Confounded be all they that worship graven images, that boast themselves of idols, &c.**

The emperor highly provoked at this insult, as he considered it, the next day ordered the leaders of this procession to be arrested, though Salust, the præfect of the Prætorian guards who was an heathen, endeavoured to persuade him not to indulge the christians with the honour of martyrdom. But seeing the emperor not able to restrain himself, he ordered a young man of the name of Theodorus, who had shewn more zeal in the business than the rest, to be seized ; and placing him upon the engine of torture, he had his back and sides torn from morning to evening, and then ordered him into strict custody. The next day Julian being informed of the fortitude of this youth, and how much the christians in general gloried in it, ordered him to be dismissed, and that no others should be tortured.

Another thing which happened at the same time, and which probably, mortified this heathen emperor still more, was that the temple of Apollo, the god whose oracle he wished to consult, was consum-

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 18. p. 194. Theodoret Lib. iii, Cap. 10, p. 131.

SECT. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 265

consumed by lightning, and the statue of Apollo, which was made of wood covered with gold, was broken to pieces. Julian, the count of the East, and uncle of the emperor, hearing of this accident in the night, went immediately to Daphne, where the mischief had happened; and seeing the temple in ruins, and the image reduced to ashes, he tortured the guardians of the place, suspecting that, with their connivance, it had been set on fire by some christians; but no confession of this kind could be extorted from them, as they persisted in saying that the fire came from above, and some country people declared that they saw it descend from heaven*.

After this, as Julian made no scruple to confiscate any property belonging to christian churches, he ordered all the vessels to be brought out of the large church which Constantine had built in Antioch; and locking the doors forbade any more assemblies to be held in it. Then, going into the church along with his uncle Julian, and two other attendants, Foelix and Elpidius, who had abandoned christianity to oblige their master, the Count is said to have shewn his contempt of the place by making water upon the table at which the eucharist was administered; and when Euzoïus, the Arian bishop of the church, would have prevented

VOL. II.

K k

it,

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii, Csp. 11. p. 181.

it, he gave him a blow on the head. And as, on this occasion, Foelix was admiring the richness and the curious workmanship of the vessels, (for they had been provided by Constantine and Constantius at a great expence) the emperor said, "See with what vessels the son of Mary is served."

Not long after this Count Julian was seized with a loathsome disease (his bowels being obstructed, and his excrements voided at his mouth) which carried him off. Foelix also died soon after, by bleeding at his mouth, and other parts of his body, and the christians naturally enough said, that the judgments of God had overtaken them for their profaneness and sacrilege, as they did with respect to Julian himself afterwards*.

It was while Julian was at Antioch that what has been related concerning Juventius and Maximus, Valentinian, and the other confessors among the soldiers, as also concerning Artemius, and Publia the deaconness happened, at all which the chagrin of Julian, with respect to christianity, could not be concealed. This ill humour kept continually increasing, and as he was always disappointed, the mortifications he met with on this head must have rendered him very unhappy.

Before he proceeded on his expedition, besides consulting Apollo of Daphne, Julian sent to consult

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 12; 13, p. 132.

sult the oracles of Delos, Delphi, Dodona, and several others, all of which returned favourable answers, encouraging him with promises of victory. One of the answers, Theodoret says, was in these words : “ All of us gods are now preparing to carry the trophies of victory to the wild river,” meaning the Tigris. “ I, the warlike Mars, will be their leader ; and let those who call Apollo the god of eloquence, and the president of the muses, laugh at these verses if they please. But I, having found out his deceit, lament his fate who is deceived.” I quote this oracle as a specimen of the folly and ambiguity of the heathen oracles in general, and to shew what kind of religion it was that this philosophical emperor preferred to christianity. The oracles collected by Herodotus, the oldest of the Greek historians, in whose time these things were in the highest credit, are no better than this. Julian, however, believing these oracles, promised himself certain victory, and threatened that on his return, he would persecute the Galileans, and place the statue of Venus in their churches*.

When Julian was on his march a circumstance happened at Berea, which does him some credit, though Theodoret relates it with a different view. one of the officers who was about the emperor's person

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 21. p. 140,

person, and who was a christian, seeing his son go over to heathenism, had banished him from his house, and the young man had taken refuge with the emperor. He invited them both to dine with him ; and placing them by each other at table, he very mildly told the father, that he should not endeavour to force his son to become a christian, since he himself did not compel any of them to adopt his religion. The officer replied, " you speak of " your wicked and accursed gods, who prefer lies " to the truth." But notwithstanding this offensive language, the emperor only advised him not to rail in that manner, and said to the young man, " Since I cannot persuade your father to take " care of you, I will.*"

It must be observed, however, that this good humour appeared at an entertainment, and upon an expedition in which it was greatly his interest to secure the good will of persons of all descriptions ; and notwithstanding all his endeavours to get an army of heathens, he could not but know what appeared to be the fact immediately after his death, that a great part of that very army which he then commanded, and the ablest of his officers, were christians.

Julian had acquired the character of a good general in Gaul, but his conduct in this expedition

* Theod. Hist. Lib: ii, Cap. 22. p. 141.

tion did not at all correspond to this idea. It is acknowledged by all, that he committed many faults, and though he was sufficiently apprized of them before hand, he persisted in following his own opinion, till he had no power either to advance or to recede ; and after the army had suffered greatly, both from the enemy, and from famine, he received his death from an arrow.

The predictions which were afterwards pretended to have been delivered concerning the approaching death of Julian, I do not think necessary to relate, because such was the credulity of the times, that they would be believed on very slight evidence ; but I cannot omit mentioning what Julian is said to have done at Carrhæ a short time before his death, the evidence of which Theodoret says was existing in his time, though I am far from saying that I think it entitled to credit.

Choosing to march through Carrhæ, rather than Edessa, because this place abounded with christians, he entered into a temple, and after performing some secret rites, he shut and sealed the door, leaving a guard of soldiers to see that it was not opened till his return. As he did not return, and a christian emperor succeeded him, it is said that the temple was opened, and that the body of a woman, who had been sacrificed for the sake of inspecting her liver, was found suspended by the hair

hair of her head, and her hands extended. It is also said, but with still less appearance of truth, that many heads of persons who had been killed for similar purposes were found at Antioch. Such, says our historian, are the rites of these abominable deities*.

These stories I do not relate because I think them deserving of credit, but because they are sufficiently similar to other facts which no person acquainted with heathen antiquity can deny ; so that they give us a just idea of the true spirit and tendency of those heathen superstitions, to which this emperor was addicted almost to infatuation. It cannot be denied that the entrails not only of animals, but also of men and women, have been thought proper subjects of inspection in various rites of the heathen religion ; a man having been thought a more valuable victim than a beast, and that the surest prognostics were procured by this means.

By means of christianity we in this country are happily removed from the actual observance of any thing of this kind, and are therefore more incredulous on the subject than we should otherwise have been ; but all history attests that there is no practice so abominable or so cruel, as not to have been authorized, by the religion of Julian ;
and

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 26, p. 143.

SECT. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 271

and he endeavoured to restore it without any restriction, as it had been practised for ages before him. In this religion there were many secret rites, at which none but the *initiated* were present, and which they were under the most solemn obligation not to reveal. These *mysteries*, as they were called, were not the sublime doctrines of the unity of God, and the vanity of the popular superstition, as Warburton paradoxically maintains, but in some cases, such things as it would have shocked the common people too much to have been acquainted with. It is impossible to know, and especially to feel, the value of christianity, without a knowledge of the heathen religion, which it happily supplanted.

The heathens were wont, as we have seen, to ascribe all the calamities that beset the empire to the disuse of their religious rites, and the introduction of christianity; but in this short reign of paganism there were several great public calamities, and among them dreadful earthquakes, one especially at Alexandria, in which the sea first receded far from the shore, and then returned with the most destructive inundation rising higher than the tops of several houses; the anniversary of which Sozomen says, the people of Alexandria observed in his time with lamps, lighted through the whole city. There was also a season of great drought during

during this short reign, followed by a famine, and that by a pestilence*. To these must be added the destruction of the great part of a fine army, the death of the emperor himself, and the consequent loss of a great extent of territory, which it was found necessary to abandon in order to make peace.

I am far from considering these things, which are liable to happen at all times, and which actually beset the Roman empire under christian as well as heathen princes, as divine judgments intended to punish the apostacy of Julian; but certainly, there was nothing either in the length or the prosperity of the reign of Julian, that could lead the heathens of that age to draw any favourable conclusion with respect to the power of the gods, to whose rites he was so much attached. If any man deserved well of the heathen gods, it was Julian, who did his utmost to restore their worship, after it had been discountenanced, and almost suppressed, in two preceding long reigns; and yet, though all the promises of these gods respected this life only, it is evident that they could do very little for him. In this view the reign of Julian affords a most instructive lesson, and no doubt many of the heathens profited by it.

It.

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 2. p. 227.

SEC. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 273

It is usual for heathens and unbelievers in christianity to make great boasts of Julian, and some christians may have spoken of him with too much abhorrence. It appears to me, from the closest attention that I have been able to give to his conduct, that he had the good qualities of temperance, ingenuity, activity, and personal courage, and also that of a wish to acquire the character of greatness and magnanimity ; but that his excessive vanity and superstition, must compel us to place him in the class of men of *little minds*, so that he was really incapable of being what it was his great ambition to be thought to be.

Justice, with a due proportion of clemency, is the most essential quality in a truly great prince ; but the levity of Julian's temper made him too precipitate in his decisions, and his partiality to the heathens prevented his being just to the christians, who were equally the subjects of his empire, and therefore equally entitled to his protection. This appeared on his accession to the empire, and his first arrival at the capital. He, no doubt, corrected many abuses ; " but justice herself," says Ammianus, as quoted by Mr. Gibbon, " wept over the fate of Ursulus, the treasurer of the empire, and his blood accused the ingratitude of Julian, whose distress had been seasonably relieved by the intrepid liberality of that honest minister.

VOL. II. L. I

“ minister. The rage of the soldiers, whom he
 “ had provoked by his indiscretion, was the cause
 “ and excuse of his death ; and the emperor, deep-
 “ ly wounded by his own reproaches, and those
 “ of the public, offered some consolation to the
 “ family of Ursulus, by the restitution of his confis-
 “ cated fortune*.”

“ A devout and sincere attachment to the gods
 “ of Athens and Rome, constituted,” as Mr. Gib-
 bon acknowledges, “ the ruling passion of Julian.
 “ The powers of an enlightened understanding
 “ were betrayed and corrupted by the influence of
 “ superstitions prejudice ; and the phantom which
 “ existed only in the mind of the emperor, had a
 “ real and pernicious effect on the government of
 “ the empire†.” From this antipathy to the
 christians “ he was sometimes tempted,” says Mr.
 Gibbon, “ by the desire of victory, or the shame of
 “ repulse, to violate the laws of prudence, and e-
 “ ven of justice,” as has been abundantly evident
 in the preceding history.

It is usual to compare the character of Julian
 with that of his uncle Constantius, to the great
 disadvantage of the latter. But the reign of Julian
 was short, and many bad reigns have begun well.
 Temptation requires time to operate ; and it ap-
 pears

* Gibbon's Hist. Vol, ii, p. 345.

† Hist. Vol. ii, p. 356.

appears to me highly probable that, in time, the moderation with which Julian affected to govern, but which he often departed from, would have given way to the most wanton cruelty.

Without considering the difference between the religion of Julian and that of Constantius (though it may be supposed that a wise man would not, in a matter of this consequence, make a foolish choice) it cannot be denied that Julian's attachment to the heathen philosophers and diviners, was not less than that of Constantius to the Arian bishops; his antipathy to christianity was not less than that of his predecessor to Athanasianism, and his cruelty to those who were obnoxious to him, far exceeded any thing that he had seen in the preceding reign. Julian's schemes to subvert christianity, deserve no other title than that of *cunning*, and have none of the characters of wisdom, or generosity. The proceedings of Constantius, though reprehensible, were always open and undisguised. When he was compelled by his brother to receive the man whom he hated the most, he did it in a frank and noble manner; and if Athanasius could have been contented with that advantage, he might have enjoyed his dignity undisturbed. But the hatred of Julian to all his christian subjects was bitter and implacable. Whatever virtues, therefore, we allow him

him, we cannot give him those of justice, greatness, or magnanimity.

S E C T I O N. VIII.

Of the Ecclesiastical Events of this Reign.

AFTER the death of George, the Arian bishop of Alexandria, the great body of christians in that city received Athanasius, who had returned from banishment, with great joy ; and in consequence of this event the Arians were expelled from all the churches, and obliged to hold their assemblies in private houses. and obscure places, choosing Lucius to succeed George.*

At the same time Lucifer bishop of Sardinia, and Eusebius bishop of Vercell, returned from their place of exile in Thebais, and after considering what they might do to establish the discipline and peace of the church, it was agreed between them, that Lucifer should go to Antioch, and Eusebius to Alexandria ; in order that holding a synod together, with Athanasius, they might settle the

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 4, p. 176,

the articles of faith. Lucifer, therefore, appointing a deacon to take his place, and promising his assent to whatever they should decree, went to Antioch, where he found the church in a very unsettled state, and which, after residing there some time; and using his best endeavours to compose matters between Meletius and Paulinus, the two orthodox bishops of the place, he left it in no better state than he found it. The particulars are not such as deserve notice at this day, but what was transacted by his friend Eusebius and Athanasius at Alexandria requires our particular attention, as it exhibits another advance in the standard of orthodoxy.

These two bishops having assembled their brethren of that country and the neighbourhood, agreed to assert the divinity of the Holy Spirit, as a person of the same substance with the two other persons of the trinity ; a new doctrine, which we shall find received a firmer establishment in a more general council held afterwards at Constantinople.

Till this time the catholics had thought differently on the subject of the Holy Spirit, without any of them incurring the charge of heresy. For some of them considered the *spirit of God* as another term for the *power of God*, and not as a proper *person* distinct from that of the Father, whose spirit it was ; any more than the spirit of a man is a
 person

person distinct from the man whose spirit it is. And those who did suppose that the Holy Spirit, had proper personality, conceived it to have been an intelligent being created by Christ; urging that, *since all things that were made, were made by him, the Holy Spirit also must have been made by him, and of course be inferior to him.*

But the Arians having, no doubt, availed themselves of this doctrine of the inferiority of the Holy Spirit in favour of that of the inferiority of the Son, the catholics were led to maintain the contrary; and now for the first time we find the Holy Spirit, by any public act of a council or synod, raised to an equality with the Son, and made to be consubstantial with him, and with the Father. It was not, however, as yet supposed that either of these two persons was *equal* to the Father, though they were held to be *of the same nature* with him; just as, according to the philosophy of the times, a beam of light was supposed to proceed from the substance of the sun, and to be of the same nature with it, yet would not have been said to be equal to it.

It was also in this council declared that Christ took not only a human body, but also a proper human soul, which they affirmed, and with great truth, citing sufficient authorities for it, to have been the opinion of all the ancients. This was in opposition to the doctrine of Appollinaris, who
main-

maintained that the *logos* was united to flesh only, and that the human soul was not necessary to his person. Whether this opinion of Apollinarius was at this time generally received by the Arians does not distinctly appear, though they must have been inclined to it, and afterwards did adopt it universally.

A third and more subtle question was discussed in this council, viz. the proper use of the two terms *essence* and *hypostasis*, which had often been used promiscuously, or without any certain definitions in this controversy. This subject had not been overlooked by Hosius, when he was sent into Egypt by Constantine, to compose the differences which were then first occasioned by the opinions of Arius, though no mention was made of it at the council of Nice. But because the distinction between these two terms had been much agitated since that time, and there was no prospect that all those who held the doctrine of that council could be brought to agree in the same use of these terms it was settled at this council, that neither of them should be made use of with respect to God; because the term *essence* is never used in the scriptures, and the term *hypostasis* only in a borrowed sense.

It was agreed, however, that it was absolutely necessary to make use of these terms in the controversy

verly with the Sabellians, lest, through want of proper terms, it should be thought that there was no difference whatever between the Father, Son and Holy Spirit ; whereas each of them was God in his own *hypostasis*, or *person*, as it was called in Latin*.

We have no account of any debate in this synod, so that it is probable that Athanasius and his particular friends made what decrees they pleased, and that the rest assented to them ; as Lucifer had promised that he would do, whatever they thought proper to decree, without being present, or hearing any thing that might be alleged for or against any question. To the members of this synod Athanasius read his apology for his flight in the Arian persecution.

Athanasius had been very active, and successful, not only in keeping the christians firm in their profession, but also in converting the heathens ; and the emperor being informed of it ordered him, as some say, to be banished, but according to Theodoret to be put to death. However, he escaped in an extraordinary manner. As he was going up the Nile, in order to take refuge in the deserts of Thebais, he was pursued by some persons whom the governor had sent to apprehend him ; when finding that he should certainly be overtaken by them

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 7, p. 178.

them, he ordered the boat that he was in to turn about, and meet his pursuers. They, not suspecting him to be the person who was fleeing from them, only asked him where Athanasius was; and he, with great presence of mind, telling them that he was not far off, they went on, while he returned to Alexandria, where he lay concealed till the death of Julian*.

After the synod at Alexandria Eusebius of Vercell followed his friend Lucifer to Antioch, but he there found the catholics divided among themselves, some adhering to Paulinus, who had been ordained by Lucifer, and others to Meletius. He therefore proceeded through Illyricum to Italy, where he found Hilary arrived before him. These two were the great champions of the catholic faith against the Arians in the West, and contributed much to the establishment of it†.

As Julian did not interfere in the disputes of the different sects of christians among themselves, the Arians were completely formed into two parties in this reign. The more moderate of them (by which I mean those who approached the nearest to the catholics) at the head of whom were

VOL. II.

M m

Macedonius

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 14. p. 189. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 15. p. 200. Theod. Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. 9. p. 130.

† Socratis Hist. Cap. 9, 10. p. 184.

Macedonius, (from whom they were often called *Macedonians*) Eleasius, Eustathius, and Sophronius, held several synods, and particularly one at Seleucia, in which they condemned the *Acacians*, as those Arians were called who receded the farthest from the catholic faith, but who were more generally termed *Actians*, or *Eunomians*, all these three appellations being derived from the names of the leaders of the party at different times. They rejected the creed of Ariminum, and confirmed that which had been settled at the former synod of Seleucia, and which was the same with that of Antioch.

Being asked on this occasion, in what respects they differed from the other Arians, they gave, according to Socrates, the following account of the matter. The Eastern churches, they said, held that Christ was of the same substance with the Father, and the followers of Aetius that he was of a different substance ; both which doctrines they held to be impious, whereas they maintained a middle opinion, holding that the Son was *like the Father* as to his hypostasis. By this means, adds the historian, they acknowledged the novelty of their opinion, as being a departure from two others, which, therefore, must have preceded theirs. This, however, is no necessary consequence*.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 10. p. 185.

P E R I O D X.

**FROM THE DEATH OF JULIAN, A. D. 362, TO
THAT OF VALENS, A. D. 379.**

S E C T I O N I.

The Reign of Jovian, consisting of seven Months.

NOTHING could have been better calculated to shew how well established the more serious and thinking part of the Roman empire were in the belief of christianity, and how little hold the principles of heathenism had on the minds of men, than the whole of the preceding history of Julian. The great bulk of mankind, being wholly occupied with the things of this life, think little about religion, in any part of the world. They receive what their ancestors delivered down to them, and may be said to believe it ; but knowing no certain ground of their faith, they are not prepared to run any risque for it. This, at least, was.

was the case in the Roman empire, with which alone I have at present any concern. Now the history that I am writing shews that the heathen subjects of the empire were almost wholly of this unthinking class of men, and that the christians in general were of a very different character, viz. thinking men, well grounded in their faith, and ready to abide by it at all risques.

From the propagation of christianity to the time of Julian, a period of near three centuries, in which christianity had been a constant object of attention, heathenism had produced not more than three or four writers against the new religion, and none who had shewn any readiness to suffer for their principles. Indeed there was nothing in that religion that could produce a spirit of martyrdom. It held out nothing for men to die, or to run any risque for. Julian himself, though in the reign of Constantius, he was a heathen in his heart, and even hated christianity, long and artfully concealed his religion, and probably would never have declared himself if he had not been emperor, or had had a good prospect of becoming one. He had the command of the army in Gaul some time before it was discovered that he was no christian; and then he shewed it with great caution, and only in proportion as he found he could do it with safety.

The

The heathens shewed their zeal only in persecuting the christians, and not in bearing persecution themselves. Nay, it does not appear that they ever shewed any readiness to hazard so much as to fight for their religion, against those whom they knew to be very unfriendly to it. Though the heathens were, no doubt a very great majority of the subjects of the Roman empire at the time that Constantine declared himself a christian, their zeal was no obstruction to his taking quiet possession of the empire, or to his holding it a longer time than any emperor whatever after the promulgation of christianity.

The same was the state of things under the sons of Constantine, a period of about fifty years. Even then the majority of the people could hardly be said to be christians, and yet the emperors did whatever they pleased, in shutting up their temples, and demolishing their idols, preventing their festivals, &c. which would, no doubt greatly offend their rivetted prejudices ; but as the persons and the property of the heathens, were not touched, it produced no rebellion ; and the religion of the emperors, and the measures which they thought proper to take in order to promote it, were generally acquiesced in.

It is evident from the state in which Julian actually found things on his accession to the empire.

pire, that, notwithstanding the edicts of the preceding emperors for that purpose, the rites of the heathen religion had never been discontinued, and that that class of people which we call *the mob* was intirely with him. Such are always prepared for every species of dissoluteness; and they would, no doubt, greatly enjoy the good eating, drinking, and debauchery, which had always been indulged on occasion of heathen sacrifices and festivals. But such people as these are neither any credit, or firm support of a cause. Without leaders of gravity and ability, who can controul their licentiousness, they can do nothing, and without a certainty of success they would not, as I have observed, even seriously fight for their religion. Whereas the christians shewed their attachment to their religion in every method besides that of fighting for it.

This appeared both during the reign, and upon the death of Julian. The christians, established as they were at the time of his accession, had they been so disposed, were no doubt, able to have given him much trouble, and probably might have intirely prevented his enjoyment of the empire. But notwithstanding the great corruption both of their religion and of their morals, christians had not yet forgotten that they were not to *fight*, but to *die* for their religion; and to the honour of christianity

christianity we read of no rebellion, or any thought of rebellion, in the reign of Julian. Had he proceeded to act the part of Diocletian, as in time he probably would have done (for Diocletian had been emperor nineteen years before he attempted so much as Julian did against christianity in the first month or two of his reign) the christians, I doubt not, would have submitted to it as they did then.

The disposition of Julian with respect to christians was evidently as hostile as that of any of the persecuting emperors ; and if he had been of opinion that he *could* have extirpated them by persecution, he would certainly have attempted it. But though this was sufficiently known at the time, his christian subjects were as obedient to him, and served him as faithfully, as the heathens. Though he took great pains to clear his army of christians, he could not do it ; and yet, notwithstanding the army was dissatisfied with his conduct as a general, and had much reason to be so, there was no mutiny among them as long as he lived.

That this army was more of a christian than an heathen one, was evident from this circumstance, that when Julian died (a sacrifice to his rashness and misconduct) the man they looked up to was a christian, one who was known to have shewn his readiness to resign his employment rather than sacrifice,

crifice, but whom, in this difficult expedition, it is clear that Julian did not think he could well do without. This was (on the refusal of Sallust) Jovian, one of the Tribunes. In the distress in which the army was involved at that time, we may be assured that nothing but an opinion of the greatest military talents could have recommended any man to their choice ; nor was the situation of an emperor, in their circumstances, a thing to be coveted. Accordingly, Jovian declined their offer ; but he was not able to resist the importunity of the whole army to take the command, notwithstanding his own attachment to christianity.

As one method for declining their proposal he told them that he was a christian, and that he would not command an army of heathens. Had this been a christian army, and any of the heathen officers had declared that they would not command an army of christians, no person who has attended to the preceding history would hesitate to say how the negociation would have ended. He would have had no army at all. But what did this army, which Julian had done every thing in his power to train up in the practice of heathenism ? What hold had this religion, whether newly embraced, or not, upon their minds. They with one voice promised that, if he would be their emperor, they would be christians ; adding that they

were

were educated in the christian faith; the oldest of them under Constantine, and the younger under his son Constantius*.

I am far from saying that I place any value on such christians. But the fact, if it be one, is a striking proof of the little sincere attachment which this army had to the heathen religion; and though this was done in the time of their distress, we do not find that they ever repented of it, or declared themselves heathens, and thought of appointing a heathen emperor, when they were in a place of safety. They did not even join the party of Procopius, whom Julian had left at the head of a body of forces in Syria, and whom it is generally thought he designed for his successor. Sometime after this, Procopius did set up for the empire, but without success.

* Socratis Hist. Lib, iii. Cap. 23, p. 199. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. iii, p. 221. Theod. Hist. Lib, iv. Cap. i. p. 147.

As Ammianus Marcellinus does not mention this circumstance, it may be thought not to be sufficiently authentic; but it is such a circumstance, as a heathen writer may well be supposed to have chosen to pass over in silence. That the auspices were taken according to the heathen ritual, which Mr. Gibbon alleges against this account of the christian historian, is no contradiction of it. As these auspices were taken to determine how they should conduct themselves after the election

On being proclaimed emperor, Jovian made a peace with the Persians on the best terms that he could; and both the army and the empire were convinced that, disgraceful as it was, it was better than could have been reasonably expected, in the embarrassing circumstances into which the rashness of Julian had brought them.

The heathens, no doubt lamented the death of Julian; and Libanius the sophist wrote an encomium upon him, particularly recommending his work against christianity. This work, however, from the particular answer to it by Cyril, and every

of Jovian, Mr. Gibbon might as well have adduced it as a proof that Jovian himself was a heathen, though Ammanius says that he was a zealous christian, *Christianæ legis studiosus*. Lib. xxv. p. 330. In the confusion and distress in which the army then was, each party would practice their religious rites, without consulting any one. Am. Marcellinus, Lib. xxv. p. 318. It is evident, at least, that the army did not reject him on account of his attachment to christianity; and though, according to Ammianus he was at first named emperor by a few only, their choice was approved by all the rest, and no other emperor appears to have been thought of while he lived. When he died, Valentinian, a man who had been banished by Julian for his christian zeal, was chosen by the same army. I do not see therefore, but that it is very possible they might have chosen Jovian in the manner that is described by the christian historians;

ry thing that we can collect concerning it, appears to have contained nothing new or important, but to have borne marks of the most inveterate prejudice and antipathy, a sure indication of a mind not sufficiently candid to give the arguments in favour of christianity their proper weight.

Accordingly, it does not appear that this work of Julian, which had more of humour than of argument in it, made a serious impression on any person whatever, notwithstanding the singular advantage of having an emperor for its author. The only seeming advantage which Julian had, arose from the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, which had been embraced by too many of the leading christians of his time. The manner in which Libanius speaks of this work sufficiently shews this. " In the long nights of the winter he wrote those
" books which shew the folly of that religion which
" teaches that a man of Palestine was a God, and
" the son of God." What Socrates says, in reply to Julian's ridiculing christianity for thus deifying a man, shews to what difficulties christians were reduced by this doctrine. " Heathens, he says, cannot understand this doctrine till they believe it," and for this purpose he quotes Is. chap. vi. *Unless ye believe, ye will not understand*.*.

We

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 23, p. 203;

We have now another christian emperor, and one who, as far as we can judge, had the prudence and good sense not to tread in the steps of Constantine and his sons, who had favoured that party of christians to which themselves were attached, and persecuted all the rest much more than they did the heathens. The reign of Jovian did not extend to many months; but in that time he might have laid a foundation for his future measures. But though it is very probable that he himself was a consubstantialist, he does not appear to have shewn much more favour, at least, to that party than to the others. He wrote however, it is said, to Athanasius, who had returned to his see on the death of Julian, together with other orthodox bishops who had been banished by Constantius, and for some reason or other had not been restored till they were expressly recalled by this emperor.

In this letter Theodoret says that Jovian desired Athanasius to send him an accurate account of theology, and that Athanasius, assembling those bishops whom he thought the best informed, wrote to Jovian to persuade him to adhere to the Nicene faith; telling him that it was the faith of all the christian churches, both in the West and in the East, except a very few who were of the Arian opinion, and that to this letter he subjoined a copy
of

of the Nicene creed*. But Philostorgius says that Candidus and Arianus, who were near relations of the emperor, prevented Athanasius (who had gone to Edessa to meet him, and endeavour to get into his good graces) from effecting his purpose; that the emperor heard what was said by both the parties, but without declaring for either, referred the discussion of their differences to another time†.

The opinion, and the measures, of the new emperor were certainly of great consequence to all the different sects, and therefore on his arrival in the Roman territories, or as soon as it could be supposed that he could be at leisure for any thing of the kind, he would, no doubt, be waited upon as Socrates says he was, by persons of every communion, hoping to gain him to their party. But I wish to think that one emperor at least might be able to give to them all such an answer as he did to one of the parties of Arians.

Those who held the opinion which Constantine had always contended for, viz. Basil of Ancyra, Sylvanus of Tarsus, and Sophronius of Pompeiopolis, who had opposed the doctrines of the Anomæans, and maintained that the Son was of a substance *similar* to that of the Father, addressed

Jovian

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 2, §. p. 148, &c.

† Philostorgii Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 6, p. 524.

Jovian, to congratulate him on his accession to the empire, and requested that what had been settled at Ariminum or Seleucia might stand, and every thing else be set aside, as done by factious persons ; or that an universal council should be held, and that those who had met in different places in the reign of Constantius should not be regarded. It is also said that this party, who are frequently called *Macedonians*, farther requested, that the other party of Arians, who held that the son was *dissimilar* to the Father, might be banished, and bishops of their own persuasion put in their places. But Jovian returned their address without any other answer than that he disliked contention, but loved those who were friends of concord ; and this proper answer, it is said, checked all farther altercation.*

About the same time a synod was held at Antioch, at which were present Eusebius of Samosata, Pelagius of Laodicea in Syria, Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine, Irenio of Gaza, and Athanasius of Ancyra, joined with Meletius of Antioch, who was a consubstantialist, and presented a paper in which they expressed their approbation of the Nicene creed, subjoining a copy of it, merely says Socrates, because they thought the emperor approved of it.

Ic

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 25. p. 206. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 4. p. 222.

It was presented by Meletius, and he found it in a book of Sabinus, intitled *a collection of the acts of synods*. In this address they say they acknowledge the necessity of some standard of faith, and that they had always adhered to the creed which had been made at Nice, according to the cautious explanation of so unusual a word as that of *consubstantial* by the Fathers, viz. that it expresses the Son being *produced without passion*, and his being *like* to the Father, as to his substance ; that it is not to be understood in the sense in which the Greeks had used the word *substance*, but had been adopted for the purpose of refuting Arius, who had said that Christ was produced *out of nothing*; an opinion on which the Anomæans, who had lately sprung up, had boldly and impudently asserted, to the destruction of the peace of the church.

Notwithstanding the censure of the historian, I have no doubt but that the generality of those who signed this address were very sincere, because Eusebius of Nicomedia, and the other heads of the same party, which prevailed in the reign of Constantius, had no objection to the Nicene creed, except what arose from the term *consubstantial*, and *this* they made no scruple of receiving when it was explained in this manner. The only person who can, with any probability, be charged with prevaricating on this occasion, was Acacius of Cæsa-

rea because in the late reign he had joined the Aetians. Though Meletius admitted the above mentioned explanation of the term *consubstantial*, Paulinus, the other orthodox bishop of Antioch, condemned it.

The answer which Jovian made to this address was to the same purpose with the former viz. that he would disturb no person on account of his faith; but that he would love and esteem above all the rest those who exerted themselves the most to restore the peace of the church. This was indeed worthy of a great prince.

Themistius the philosopher in an oration which he wrote on his consulship, highly commends this emperor for these generous sentiments, for giving liberty to all people to worship as they pleased, and repressing all flattery*.

As this heathen philosopher praised this emperor for his universal toleration on the subject of religion, it does not appear to me to be at all probable that, on his accession to the empire, he ordered, as Socrates says, all the heathen temples to be shut up, so that the heathen priests presently absconded, and that an immediate end was put to all the business of public sacrificing, with which all men had been disgusted in the reign of Julian: though no doubt, whatever of this kind had been
done

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 25, p. 208.

done to please Julian would be discontinued. It is probable also that what he says of the heathen philosophers, who had flocked in crowds to the court of Julian, being now glad to change their peculiar habits, and to mix with the crowd, dressed like other people, would be in a great measure true*.

That Jovian gave no orders for the suppression of heathenism is the more probable, as it was always said that his successor Valens, who persecuted all the christians who were not of his persuasion, left the heathens unmolested ; and as we do not know that he either made, or altered, any laws relating to that subject, it is probable that, in this respect, he acted as his predecessor had done.

We do not find that any person was, in fact, molested on account of his religion in this reign, and though a short one, it allowed him time sufficient for that purpose. Jovian may therefore be considered as having been sincere in his declarations against persecution, and in favour of universal toleration, and if he had lived longer, he would (whatever had been his own private opinions) it may be hoped, have been such a model for other princes with respect to their conduct in matters of religion, as had not been given by any of his predecessors, and which has been followed by very

VOL. II.

O o

few

*Socratis Hist. Lib. iii, Cap. 24. p. 205.

few who have come after him. But this prince died suddenly, before he reached Constantinople, in a room in which he slept; owing as was generally thought, either to its having been newly-plastered, or which will now be thought much more probable, to the fumes of charcoal that were burning in it. Ammianus Marcellinus says that Jovian was addicted to wine and women; but he was of a benevolent disposition, and of a chearful temper*.

SECTION II.

From the Accession of Valentinian and Valens, A. D. 364, to the Death of Athanasius A. D. 371, containing an Account of the Persecution of the Catholics, and the moderate Arians by Valens.

JOVIAN being dead, the choice of the army fell upon Valentinian, the same who has been mentioned as thinking himself defiled by the holy water with which he was sprinkled; when he was entering a heathen temple together with Julian, and whom he had banished on pretence of some

* Lib. xxv. p. 330,

some deficiency in his military duty, but who had been recalled by Jovian, and had met him at Nice. At the request of the soldiers, Valentinian made Valens his brother partner with him in the empire, and assigned to him the government of the East, while he took upon himself that of the West.

It happened that the two brothers were of different opinions on the subject of the trinity, Valentinian adhering to the Nicene creed, but without persecuting the Arians; while Valens, who had been brought up under Eudoxius, was not only a strenuous assertor of the Arian doctrine, and in its more obnoxious form, viz. that of the *Anomæans* but an unrelenting persecutor both of the *Consubstantialists* and of the other Arians.

The state of parties, and the situation of the principal bishops at the accession of these two emperors, are thus stated by Socrates. Liberius was bishop of Rome. At Alexandria Athanasius was at the head of the *Consubstantialists*, and Lucius of the Arians. At Antioch Euzoius was at the head of the Arians, and Paulinus and Meletius at the head of separate congregations of *Consubstantialists*. Cyril was at Jerusalem, and Eudoxius the Arian at Constantinople, though the *Consubstantialists* had a small congregation in the city, and the Macedonians, who had separated from the
Acacians

Acacians at Seleucia, had churches of their own in several cities*.

Valens soon discovered his attachment to the Arian party by banishing Meletius from Antioch, though he suffered Paulinus to remain there on account of his high character for piety : but he banished all others who refused to communicate with Euzoius.

The bishops of the Macedonian party having applied to the emperor to call a council ; he, thinking that they did not differ from Eudoxius and Acacius, consented to it ; and accordingly they met at Lampfacum, seven years after the holding of the synod at Seleucia ; and there they confirmed the creed which had been composed at Antioch, and which had again been subscribed at Seleucia, condemning that of Ariminum, to which the historian says they had themselves consented. They also passed a sentence of deposition against the followers of Acacius and Eudoxius, the latter not having been able to prevent this decision, on account of the civil war with Procopius, which was then depending, and which prevented the emperor from attending to ecclesiastical matters† ; so that

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 1. p. 213. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 6. p. 225.

† Procopius was a formidable rival of Valens a considerable time. He was received with great joy at Con-

that Eleusius of Cyzicum had the upper hand, maintaining the opinion of Macedonius, which, he says, had made but little progress before ; but the confirmation of it in this synod he took to be the reason why it afterwards prevailed so much on the borders of the Hellespont.

Thus the doctrine of the Son being *like* the Father was for the present established. But Eudoxius having given his representation of the matter to the emperor, he presently annulled all the decrees of the council, and sending the members of it into banishment, he gave their churches to the friends of Eudoxius*.

Valens having suppressed the rebellion of Procopius, shewed his resentment at what had been done at Lampfacum, by compelling Eleusius, who had distinguished himself the most in favour of the Macedonian party, to assent to the doctrine of the Anomæans, which Socrates calls that of the *Arians* ; and indeed properly enough, as their doctrine of the Son being *unlike* the Father, was the natural

stantinople, but was at length deserted by his chief supporters, on account of his grievous exactions, for which the government of Valens had been complained of.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 4. p. 216. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 7. p. 227.

natural and necessary consequence of what had been asserted by Arius, that the Son was *made out of nothing*, while the Father alone was uncreated.

Eleusius, however, soon repented of his compliance, and in the presence of his congregation acknowledged himself unworthy of being their bishop, as he had denied the faith. But they, greatly respecting his virtues, insisted upon his continuing to be their pastor, which he would have done but that Eudoxius, having ordained Eunomius the bishop of Cyzicum, he was obliged, by the orders of the emperor, to quit the place, and his followers built a small church for themselves without the city. Eunomius, however, not being able to recommend himself to his congregation, was obliged to leave the place, and to take refuge with Eudoxius at Constantinople*.

About this time, which was the twelfth year after the destruction of Nicomedia by an earthquake, there was another which destroyed the city of Nice, and after this a third which overthrew part of the city of Germa on the Hellespont, preceded by a fall of large hail stones at Constantinople. These were interpreted by the orthodox party as divine judgements for the favour that was shewn to the Arians. But, says Socrates, neither

Eudoxius

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 6, 7, 8, p. 217, &c.

Eudoxius nor Valens regarded them, but still went on banishing the orthodox bishops. Two, however by particular providence, escaped, viz. Basil of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Gregory of Nazianzum, in its neighbourhood, the former of whom obtained the surname of *the great*, and the latter, that of *theologus*, or *the divine*; and we shall find them acting an extraordinary part, in carrying the system of orthodoxy higher than any persons had done before them*.

The vanity of all attempts to controul men's opinions by force, or to engage them, by any kind of intrigue, to subscribe what they do not really believe, appeared remarkably in the general, and to all appearance the cordial reception, which was given to the Nicene faith in the Western empire, presently after the death of Constantius, who had taken so much pains to change it, and who had so far succeeded, as to compel all the bishops to subscribe the creed which had been presented at Ariminum. Now, however, owing in part to the influence of Valentinian, who was a Consubstantialist, and in part to their former prejudices (to which the sentiments of their masters Constantine and Constans, the sons of Constantine the Great, as well as those of the Father himself, no doubt contributed) the Western bishops in general, and Liberius

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 11. p. 223.

berius himself at their head, were the avowed advocates of the Nicene faith. And the see of Rome, being considered as at the head of the whole Western church, which was in concord with it, was now as much as in any preceding time, the common refuge of the distressed in any part of the empire. A bishop in communion with this great see the influence of which, without any formal agreement, or act of council, was so overbearing, could not be despised or trampled upon, whatever his neighbours might think of him.

So tyrannical were the proceedings of Valens, and those of the high Arian or Anomoean party, that the Confubstantialists were almost exterminated in all the Eastern empire; and that in Thrace, Bythinia, the country about the Hellespont, and even the provinces more to the East, they had neither churches nor clergy. The Macedonians also, or the more moderate Arians, were dreadfully harrassed. In this situation, alarmed at the prospect of the evils impending over them, they conferred together by messengers (for they could not meet in a body) and agreed to have recourse to Valentinian, and the bishop of Rome, and to join their communion, rather than that of Valens and Eudoxius. Agreeing, therefore, with the Confubstantialists, they sent a solemn embassy to Italy, consisting of Eustathius bishop of Sebestia, who had

had been so often deposed, Sylvanus of Tarsus, and Theophilus of Castabala in Cilicia, to inform Valentinian and the pope (as by anticipation we may now call the bishop of Rome) that they wished to be in communion with them, since they did not differ in respect to articles of faith, but held the Consubstantial doctrine.

The emperor not being at Rome, these ambassadors were received by Liberius alone, and at first he expressed much distrust of them, as having been of the Arian party. But they assured him that they had repented, that they reprobated the doctrine of the Anomœans, and were really Consubstantialists as well as himself, confessing that the Son did not differ in any respect from the Father; and indeed that by the phrase *of the like substance*, they never had any meaning different from that which had been annexed to the phrase of *the same substance*. This verbal acknowledgment, though it was as express as words could make it, not removing all suspicion, these ambassadors gave Liberius a copy of their faith in writing, in which they expressed in the fullest manner their consent to the Homœousian doctrine, and subjoined the Nicene creed itself.

Upon this Liberius deferred no longer to receive them into his communion. He moreover wrote in their favour to the principal bishops in

the East, acquainting them with the satisfaction which they had given him. He also took this opportunity of assuring them that, though the bishops of the West had been deceived at Ariminum, they had all abjured the blasphemies of that council, and were unanimous in their adherence to the faith of Nice. He exhorts them to do the same that *they* had done, if they had been drawn aside by force or artifice ; and he concludes with declaring, that they should hold no communion with any who would not now reject all the blasphemies of Arius, together with those of the Sabellians, and other heretics.

With these letters the ambassadors went to Sicily ; and having called a synod of the bishops of that island, and made profession of the Nicene faith before them, they received letters from them similar to those of Liberius. With all these letters they returned to their friends in the East, whom they found assembled at Tyana, and among them were Eusebius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Athanasius of Ancyra, Pelagius of Laodicea, Zeno of Tyre, Paul of Emesa, Gregory of Nazianzum, and many others, who had met at Antioch in the time of Jovian, and had there assented to the Nicene creed.

Being greatly encouraged by the reception which their ambassadors had met with in the West, they

they proposed to call a council at Tarsus, and there make profession of the Nicene faith, but they were prevented by Eudoxius, whose influence with Valens was so great, that he was more exasperated against those bishops than ever.*

They were also farther discouraged by what passed at an assembly of thirty four bishops of Asia proper. For though these approved the zeal of their brethren to unite the churches, they objected to the term *consubstantial*, and declared their preference of the creed of Antioch and Selucia, as having been composed by Lucian the Martyr, and approved by their ancestors.

The emperor, not content with forbidding the council at Tarsus, ordered that all the bishops who had been deposed in the time of Constantius, and had not recovered the possession of their sees in the time of Julian, should be expelled from their churches.

The magistrates of Egypt, having received this order, endeavoured to carry it into execution with respect to Athanasius, notwithstanding the objection of his numerous friends, who alledged that he did not come under the description of the bishops who were to be banished, as having been recalled
by

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 12. p. 223. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 10, p. 230.

by Constantius himself and afterwards expelled by Julian.

Though the governor seemed to acquiesce in this plea, Athanasius, probably fearing the consequences of a tumult, withdrew of his own accord and concealed himself. Afterwards the emperor himself wrote to him to invite him to return, probably fearing the resentment of his brother on his account. The Arians themselves also thought that he might be the cause of more disturbance out of his see than in it.

It was while Athanasius was bishop of Alexandria, that christianity was introduced into Ethiopia, where it seemed to have been extinct notwithstanding the conversion of the eunuch of Candace queen of that country by Philip. Meropius a philosopher of Tyre, a Greek by nation and religion, had taken a passage in a ship, on the Red Sea, and had with him two boys Trumentius, and Œdesius. Their vessel was cast away on the coast of Abyssinia, when Meropius was slain in defending himself against the natives, but the two boys were carried to Axum, where the court then was. Both of them being much admired, Œdesius was set over the king's household, and Trumentius, being entrusted with the education of the king's sons, impressed their minds in favour of christianity ; and going to Egypt was ordained bishop of Abyssinia

Abyssinia by Athanasius, then bishop of Alexandria. By this means the nation in general was by degrees converted to christianity. *Bruce's Travels* p. 508.

The case of Athanasius himself excepted, Sozomen says that this persecution of Valens very much resembled that of the heathens, all being banished who would not receive the creed of the emperor*.

Eudoxius dying after he had held the see of Constantinople eleven years according to Sozomen, and nineteen according to Socrates, Demophilus was chosen by the Arians to succeed him. But the advocates for the Nicene faith took this opportunity of ordaining Evagrius by means of Eustathius, who had formerly been of Antioch, but having been recalled from banishment by Jovian, lived at Constantinople. A great disturbance beginning to be occasioned by this event, the emperor banished both Evagrius and Eustathius†.

The Arians, encouraged by this success, were more than ever insolent and outrageous, which compelled the other party to have recourse to the justice and clemency of the emperor. But instead

* Lib. vi. Cap. 12. p. 233. Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 13. p. 229.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 13. p. 235. Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 14. p. 230.

stead of obtaining any redress of their grievances, they are said to have been treated with a degree of treachery and cruelty so shocking to humanity as not to be at all credible. Eighty of the catholic clergy, the chief of whom were Urbanus, Theodorus, and Menedemus, waiting upon the emperor at Nicomedia, to beg his protection against the violence of the Arians ; he was very much provoked, but without expressing much anger at the time, he is said to have given orders to Modestus the præfect to put them all to death. This inhuman order the officer is said to have executed by sending these eighty bishops to sea, as if they were going into banishment, and privately ordering the crew to set the ship on fire, and then leave it. In consequence of this the ship was burned, and they all perished miserably. A famine which after this event afflicted all Phrygia was thought to be a punishment for this cruelty and injustice*. That the bishops were sent to banishment, and that they perished by the ship taking fire, is not improbable ; but that this was done by order of the emperor, or of the præfect, is highly improbable. As to the famine, in order to its being a proper judgment in this case, it ought to have affected the emperor and his Arian subjects only.

Not

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 16. p. 331. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 14. p. 236.

Not satisfied with this act of cruelty, the emperor, being at Antioch, is said to have persecuted the Confubstantialists more than ever, putting many of them to death in various ways, and some by throwing them into the river*. It must be considered, however that all the historians are Confubstantialists, that no names of any persons so put to death are mentioned, and that Sozomen contents himself with saying that such things were *said* to have been done†.

The people of Edessa, according to our historians, were saved from a general massacre by the intrepidity of a woman. The emperor desiring to see a church in that city, and being offended at the crouds of people who were assembled on that occasion, ordered them all to be put to death, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of the military officer, merely because they were Confubstantialists. The order however being given, many persons refrained from going to the place. But very early in the morning a woman with a child in her arms presented herself; and when the officer would have dismissed her, by reminding her of his orders, she said she had heard of them, and that she had come on purpose to suffer martyrdom, and likewise to give her child that honour. The emperor

* Socratis Hist. Cap. 17. p. 232.

† Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 18. p. 240.

peror, it is said, seeing the resolution of the people, recalled his order.* But it is not at all credible that any such order was ever given.

While Athanasius lived, the emperor did not think proper to disturb the Confubstantialists in Egypt. But he dying† in the second consulship of Gratus, and the first of Probus, and Peter another Confubstantialist being chosen in his place the Arians took that opportunity of seizing upon the churches of Egypt. The emperor being then at Antioch, Euzoius the bishop of that city prevailed upon him to send him thither, in order to place Lucius an Arian in the see of Alexandria; and this he effected by a military force, imprisoning and dispersing the orthodox clergy; the commanding officer having orders to banish all those whom Lucius should think proper to be so disposed of. Some of them, it is said, were tortured.

Peter

* Socratis Hist. Lib iv. Cap. 18, p. 233. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 18, p. 240.

† Notwithstanding the figure that Athanasius makes in the ecclesiastical history of his age, and his long continuance on the public theatre of action, we have no *data* by which to form a just idea of his character in private life. All we know of him is that he was a steady champion for the Nicene faith, and must have been possessed of a considerable degree of firmness and resolution, though he does not appear to have had the spirit of martyrdom that Mr. Gibbon ascribes to him.

Peter himself, having made his escape, fled to Damasus bishop of Rome*.

The monks of Egypt being zealous advocates for the Nicene faith, Lucius, not being able to gain them over by persuasion, employed force †; and taking with him the military commander of Egypt, advanced against them into the desert. But though he exercised great cruelties upon them, it was without any effect; so that at length he desisted from his attempts. At this time there were several monks of great eminence in Egypt, particularly the two Macarii, Pambo, Heracles, and other disciples of Anthony, Ammon, Didymus, Arsenius, Hilarus, and Ammonius; of all of whom many idle things are related by Socrates and others, not worth repeating after them‡. A great champion of the Trinitarians at this time in Egypt, was Didymus, a blind man, but who excelled in all

Vol. II. Q q branches

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 20, 21, 22. p. 234, &c.
Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 19. p. 241.

† Fleury says he made a law to compel them to bear arms. It is probable that many persons chose this idle mode of life, who had considerable property, and endeavoured by this means to exempt themselves from an obligation to civil offices.

‡ Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 23, 24. p. 236. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 20, p. 242.

branches of science. He wrote three books on the subject of the trinity*.

According to Sozomen, a great majority of the Egyptians at this time adhered to the Nicene faith. It was also preached among the Osdroeni, and in Cappadocia, by Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzum. At Antioch he acknowledges that the Arians were the most numerous, though the catholics were not few. The Scythians he also says, retained the orthodox faith which was professed by Vetrician their bishop. The emperor, paying him a visit would have persuaded him to communicate with the Arians; but finding that the people would not communicate even with himself, he ordered the bishop to be banished. Seeing, however, that the people took this very ill, he revoked his order. This was at Tomi, on the Euxine sea, the capital of the Scythians, who were at that time a useful barrier between the empire and the more northern barbarians†.

This violent persecution of the orthodox, Socrates says, was in a great measure repressed by the remonstrances of Themistius, a heathen philosopher, who addressed the emperor on the subject, at Antioch; representing to him, that the difference of opinion among the christians was not near so great

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 25, p. 244.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 21. p. 244.

great as among the Greeks, whose sects amounted in all to more than three hundred, and that the Deity was pleased with this diversity of opinion, because it appeared by this very circumstance, that his majesty was so great, that it was difficult to attain to the knowledge of it. Upon this it is said that Valens refrained from persecuting any to death, and contented himself with banishing those who were obnoxious to him*. This is the first instance we have met with of any heathen philosopher pleading the cause of toleration. But it was only when the heathens stood in need of toleration themselves, and when the experience of some centuries had opened their eyes with respect to the folly of persecution. Valens's engagement in the Gothic war is said to have been another reason of his ceasing to persecute the orthodox. Having left Antioch to go upon this expedition, the orthodox party in Alexandria, encouraged by the letters which Peter had brought from Damasus the bishop of Rome, expelled Lucius the Arian bishop, and put Peter in his place†.

What makes it almost certain that the account of the persecution of the orthodox by Valens is much exaggerated by the historians, and that he never proceeded farther than the banishment of the bishops

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 32. p. 255.

† Ibid. Cap. 35, 37. p. 57, 258.

bishops who were obnoxious to him (which had been done in the former reigns) is, that the bishops who composed the council at Constantinople in the time of Theodosius say nothing of the punishment of death, or of any thing besides banishment, in their synodical letter, in which they enumerate all their hardships under Valens. One Stephen, indeed, is said to have been stoned to death after his return from banishment. But this was probably by the mob, and after the death of Valens*.

SECTION III.

Of Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzum, with the Change that took place in the Doctrine of the Trinity chiefly by their means,

WHILE, after the death of Athanasius, Didymus, as I have observed, was opposing the Arians in Egypt, the catholic faith had two most able defenders in Asia Minor, viz. Basil of Cæsarea, and Gregory of Nazianzum, of whom, because they carried the doctrine of the trinity to its present height, and also greatly distinguished themselves

* Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 9. p. 203;

themselves by their eloquence and their writings, I shall give a more particular account.

When they were young men they both studied at Athens, under the celebrated Sophists Himerius and Prohærcius, where they were acquainted with Julian, and after this they attended the lectures of Libanius at Antioch. Being there famous for their eloquence, they were by some advised to teach it, and by others to apply to the bar. But despising these arts, they both betook themselves to the monastic life, which was in great vogue at that time, and considered as the highest pitch of religion. They also particularly applied themselves to the study of the works of Origen ; and whereas the writings of this great man had been thought to favour the Arians, they took great pains to shew that he had been misunderstood, and that his works were really favourable to the contrary doctrine.

Basil was first promoted to the rank of deacon by Meletius of Antioch. Afterwards he went to Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the place of his nativity, where Eusebius was then bishop ; but differing with him, and the other clergy of the place, he retired to the Monks of Pontus. This flight of Basil greatly encouraged the Arian party ; but afterwards returning to Cæsarea, he was reconciled to Eusebius, and succeeded to the bishoprick after his

his death. In the mean time his friend Gregory strenuously supported the trinitarian doctrine at Nazianzum, where his father had been bishop, and afterwards at Constantinople, where himself was bishop for some time in the reign of Theodosius.

Valens, hearing how much these two men exerted themselves in opposing his favourite system, sent for Basil to Antioch, and after some discourse on the subject, it is said, threatened him with death, if he did not embrace his faith. Basil was so far from being intimidated by this threatening, that, in an insulting manner (which seems to shew that he did not think he had much to fear) he challenged the emperor to put him to death. But the historian says that when he was under confinement, a son of the emperor was taken very ill, and that the father, being alarmed, sent for Basil, and told him that if his was the right faith the child would be restored to his prayers. Basil replied that, if the emperor believed as he himself did, and the church should by that means be united, he could assure him that his child would recover. But presently after he died, and the emperor dismissed the bishop. This story having so much the air of a fable, it is probable that the whole history of Basil, being threatened with death, and of his behaviour on that occasion, with which it is connected, is intitled to very little credit.

Basil

SAC. III. CHRISTIAN CHURCH 818

Basil had two brothers, Peter and Gregory, of whom the former was devoted to a monastic life; but Gregory even rivalled his brother in eloquence, and was afterwards bishop of Nissa in Capadocia.*

It is in the writings of these three champions of orthodoxy, that we first find the high trinitarian doctrine of the *full equality* of the Son to the Father. The Antinicens Fathers had uniformly maintained the great inferiority of the Son to the Father, as they did that of a beam of light to the sun. The Nicene Fathers went no farther than to assert that the Son was *of the same substance* with the Father, and nothing was said of his *equality* to him till this period, though it is no difficult consequence from the idea of his being of the same substance, and therefore *truly God*. Because if he be of the same nature with the Father, and is truly God as he is, he cannot want any attribute of proper divinity, and therefore must be *in all respects* equal to the Father.

This doctrine, however would have staggered the christian world, and especially the common people, who were well grounded in the doctrine of *the unity of God*, too much, to have been borne with any patience, in an earlier period. Besides, it is only

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv: Cap. 26, p. 245. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 15, 16, 17. p. 237, &c.

only by giving much attention to any proposition that all its consequences are distinctly perceived. But all the real consequences of any acknowledged doctrine must at length be admitted; and whatever repugnance there may be in the minds of any persons to the admission of them, it must give way in time. Now controversy, more than any thing else, draws the attention of men to their principles, and to all the consequences of them; and this it was which at length produced the doctrine of the trinity, as it was maintained by these three writers, and as it has been explained and defended from their time to the present, though it did not immediately obtain the sanction of any council:

Athanasius does not appear to have advanced any farther than the doctrine of *consubstantiality*, and that of God having *always* been a *Father*; but that the Son is *equal* to the Father, does not, I believe, occur in any of his writings, not even the latest of them. This doctrine, however, is expressed in a great variety of phrases, and is strenuously contended for in the writings of the three champions of orthodoxy who are now before us. “The Son,” says Basil, “is all that the Father is*.” “There is,” says Gregory of Nissa, “a whole Father in a whole Son, and a whole Son in a whole

* De Fide Opern, Vol. i p. 430.

SECT. III. . CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 341

“ whole Father*.” “ Whoever,” says Gregory of Nazianzum, “ maintains that any of the three persons is inferior to the other, overturns the whole trinity†.”

The orthodox having now three persons in the trinity, each of them possessed of all the attributes of divinity, found themselves more embarrassed than ever with the objection to their doctrine, as making *more Gods than one*. For unquestionably, if the Father, Son, and Spirit, separately considered, be each of them possessed of all divine attributes, in the same degree, there must be *three complete Gods*, and not *one only*. The orthodox writers of this age, therefore, were obliged to have recourse to new illustrations of their doctrine, unknown to their predecessors, which may be seen in my *History of early Opinions concerning Christ*.

But being obliged to acknowledge that all their illustrations were deficient, they had another resource, equally unknown in former ages, which was that the doctrine of the trinity was a *mystery*, absolutely inexplicable by reason, and to be received by *faith only*; and whatever is incomprehensible to us in nature was now first adduced as an argument for acquiescing in the unintelligible mysteries of theology. The authority of the church

VOL. II.

R r

was

* Opera Vol. ii, p. 901.

† Or. xx. Opera, p, 338.

was also brought in to silence all cavils from the quarter of impertinent reasoning. "There are "mysteries," says Gregory of Nazianzum, "in all "nature, and in the mind of man. If, you who "enquire concerning those things do not under- "stand yourself ; if you do not understand those "things which you can examine with your senses, "how can you understand God, what, and how "great he is. This is great folly*."

"Some tenets in the church," says Basil, "we "receive as preserved in writing, but some are of "apostolical tradition, handed down as *mysteries* ; "both of which have the same force with respect "to piety ; and no one will question them who "is at all acquainted with the laws of the "church†."

Austin also, who wrote in a later period, pleaded for implicit faith on the authority of the prophet Isaiah. "It was, therefore," he says, "ra- "tionally said by the prophet (ch. vi.) "*Unless ye "believe ye will not understand* ; where he doubt- "less distinguishes these two things, and advises "that we first *believe*, that we may be able to *un- "derstand* what we believe ; so that it seems rea- "sonable that faith should precede reason‡." It
it

* Or. xxix, Opera, p. 493.

† De Sp. S. Cap. 27, Opera Vol. ii, p. 350.

‡ Epist. 222. Opera Vol. 2, p. 859.

is obvious, however, to conclude, that it could only be some great absurdity in doctrine that could lead men to have recourse to so manifest an absurdity in the mode of defending it. For nothing can be more palpably so, than to require that a *belief* of any proposition should precede, and not follow (as in all cases it necessarily must) the *understanding* of it. What would any person, unacquainted with Greek, say to my requiring his assent to any proposition expressed in that language. Would he not reply, that he could not possibly tell whether my proposition was true or false, till he understood the meaning of it. Now it is evident that phrases and propositions, in a known language, which convey no distinct ideas, are the very same in this respect as if they had been the words of an unknown tongue.

SECTION IV.

Transactions in the West till the Death of Valentinian, A. D. 375.

HAVING seen what was doing in the East, let us now turn our eyes towards the West, where Valentinian governed. And it is something remarkable that as, after the death of Constantine, the Western emperors were of the Nicene faith, when the emperor of the East was an Arian, so it happened now. But Valentinian, though a zealous christian, and of a religious persuasion different from that of his brother, did not interfere as he did in ecclesiastical matters ; but for the most part very wisely left the bishops to conduct their own affairs as they pleased*.

The West was not, however, altogether free from the effects of clerical ambition and faction ; for upon the death of Liberius, A. D. 356, Damasus being chosen in his place, Ursinus, a deacon, got himself elected and formed a separate congregation ; and some of the citizens taking part with one of the bishops, and some with the other, and both sides having recourse to arms, several persons

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 21, p. 245.

sons were killed. But at length the præfect of the city put an end to the sedition by fixing Damasus in the sec*.

The only bishop of eminence in the West who espoused the Arian doctrine at this time, was Auxentius of Milan, who with a few others held that the Son was of a nature different from that of the Father, being Eunomians. Some attempts were also made to promote this doctrine in Gaul, on which account a synod was assembled at Rome, consisting of bishops from many provinces, when Auxentius and his party were excommunicated, the Nicene faith was confirmed, and the creed of Ariminum condemned.†

Auxentius being deposed, the synod requested that the emperor himself would appoint a person to succeed him. But he very handsomely declined it, and some of the people wishing for an Arian bishop, and others an orthodox one, and a dangerous sedition being apprehended in consequence of it, Ambrose who was then the civil governor of the province, went into the church to prevent it; and being a man universally esteemed, they all with one voice cried that he should be their bishop, though he had not even been baptized.

He

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 23. p. 245. Socratis Hist. Lib. iv, Cap. 29, p. 251.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 23. p. 246.

He was very far from being desirous of this office, and for some time resolutely refused it ; but the emperor approving of the nomination, he consented, and was presently baptized and ordained, Ambrose was a man of singular integrity and courage ; and this he soon shewed, by reprov- ing some of the magistrates in the presence of the emperor himself, who was so far from being offended, that when it was complained of, he said he knew what he himself had to expect from his freedom*.

Ambrose was a strenuous defender of the Nicene faith, and appears in his writings to have carried the doctrine of the trinity as high in the West: as Basil and the two Gregories did in the East. The famous Austin was his disciple, and adopted his sentiments in most things.

Valentinian hearing of the controversies in the East, and with the concurrence of his brother (and as Theodoret says before he became an Arian, a change which he ascribes to the influence of his wife and of Eudoxius†) called a council in Illyricum ; and the bishops assembled there confirmed the Nicene faith. No new creed was composed upon this occasion, but a synodical letter was addressed

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 30. p. 252. Theod. Lib. iv. Cap. 7. p. 153. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap: 24, p. 248.

† Lib. iv. Cap. 12, p. 163.

addressed to the bishops of Asia, Phrygia, Carophrygia, and Pacatiana, which had probably been the principal seat of the controversies which occasioned the calling of the synod. In this letter the members of the council, without entering into any argument, strongly assert the necessity of holding the Holy Spirit to be consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and anathematize those who maintained the contrary doctrine. They moreover say that the kingdom of heaven is prepared for those who believed as they did in this respect, but nothing is here said of the *equality* of the persons in the consubstantial trinity.

Both the emperors joined in enforcing the decrees of this council, which was held on the confines of both their territories, and they both joined in a letter to the bishops of the same provinces to which the synodical epistle had been sent. In this letter the emperors reasoned much more on the subject than the bishops had done, particularly explaining the sense in which the term *consubstantial* was to be understood; and it is observable that, as they explain it, it might be applied to any *creature*, so that both the parties might agree in the same subscription; but it would only be in words, nothing in reality being decided by it*.

While

* Theod. Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 8, 9, p. 154. &c.

While the council was assembled at Illyricum, they received an epistle from Damascus bishop of Rome, and the other bishops who had deposed Auxentius, exhorting them to continue firm in the Nicene faith, and expressing their hope that this would soon become universal, as those who had been deceived at Ariminum had presently after repented of their compliance.*

Ecclesiastical history says nothing farther concerning Valentinian, who died suddenly, A. D. 375, after giving vent to his indignation in a speech to the Sarmatian ambassadors, in the fifty fifth year of his age, and the fourteenth of his reign. He was succeed by his two sons, Gratian, whom he had raised to the purple A. D. 367, and Valentinian the second, whom the army proclaimed emperor immediately on his death, though he was then but a child†.

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 23. p. 246.

† Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 31, p. 253.

SECTION V.

From the Death of Valentinian, A. D. 375, to that of Valens A. D. 379, containing an Account of the Controversy concerning the Holy Spirit, the Opinions of Apollinaris, and the Divinations of some Heathen Philosophers, with a View to find who should be the next Emperor.

TOWARDS the end of the reign of Valens, who survived his brother four years, the controversy about the Holy Spirit, which had begun some time before, was much agitated, almost as much as that concerning the consubstantiality of the Son had ever been; and on this question both the sects of the Arians, viz. those who held that the Son was of a substance *like*, and those who held that it was *unlike*, that of the Father, agreed. For both considered the Holy Spirit, either as the Spirit or power of God the Father, and therefore not *a person* distinct from him, or an intelligent being below the Son in rank, and of a substance unlike that of the Father. But all those who thought the Son to be of the same substance with the Father thought the same with respect to the Holy Spirit.

This, however, had not always been the case, as is evident with respect to Eusebius the historian, who held that the Holy Spirit was created by the Son, which was also the opinion of all before the council of Nice, who thought the Holy Spirit to be a person.

The great defenders of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit after Athanasius, who appeared in this controversy a little before his death, were Apollinaris of Laodicea, Basil of Cæsarea, and Gregory of Nazianzum. But according to Sozomen the letter which I have mentioned from the bishop of Rome contributed very much to establish the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Spirit in the East*. It is evident, however, from the letters of Basil, that the doctrine of the divinity of the spirit was very unpopular in all his diocese, and in the East in general; and that there were many more unitarians in those countries than any historians speak of.

About this time the two Apollinaris's, father and son, the same who distinguished themselves by their ingenious compositions to supply the place of those Greek classics, which Julian did not permit to be read by christians, distinguished themselves much more by a schism which they made in the church, maintaining, as I have mentioned

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 22. p. 245.

tioned before, that the *logos* supplied the place of a human soul in the person of Christ. Apollinaris the father was originally of Egypt, and first opened a school of grammar at Berytus, afterwards he removed to Laodicea, where he married, and had this son, who became a teacher of rhetoric in the same city. Being very intimate with Epiphanius the heathen sophist, and not listening to the admonitions of George the bishop of the place, to refrain from his society, they were excommunicated by him; and upon this they began to form separate congregations, teaching the doctrine above-mentioned*.

Sozomen adds that both the father and the son had given offence to the bishops of Laodicea, who were Arians, by their attachment to Athanasius, and that they greatly promoted the interest of their party by the numerous hymns which they composed to be sung by persons of all conditions, and in all situations. Their opinion was much opposed at this time by Damasus bishop of Rome, and also

* Socratis Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 46, p. 163.

Apollinaris denied that there was any *vous* in Christ, separate from his divinity; but did not say he had no *soul*, possessed of the inferior faculties. He accused the orthodox of making two persons in Christ, and he maintained that the divinity and the flesh made but one nature. *La Croze Ind. p. 26.*

so by Peter bishop of Alexandria. But we shall find more public notice taken of it hereafter*.

According to Gregory of Nazianzum, Apollinaris held two other doctrines, which gave great offence to the orthodox. One of them was that the *flesh* which the logos assumed was what he brought from Heaven, and that he did not take it of the Virgin. The other opinion was, that *the logos suffered* along with the body to which it was united, that it even died, and was raised from the dead by the power of the Father, an opinion which we shall find adopted by Eutyches, in a later period. In support of the former of these opinions Apollinaris alleged the words of the evangelist John iii, 13. *No man hath ascended up into Heaven, but the son of man who is in Heaven*; and also that of the apostle Paul, 1st Cor. xv. 17, *the second man is the Lord from Heaven*†. But as no controversial work of Apollinaris is now extant, it is not easy to say what his opinions really were, or how he defended them.

About this time the followers of Eunomius, if not Eunomius himself, greatly alarmed the christian world by their innovation, as it was called, in the administration of baptism. For, in imitation of the Paulians, or Unitarians, they no longer baptized

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 35. p. 250.

† Ibid. Cap. 27. p. 254.

tized in the name of the *Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, but into the *death of Christ*, probably founding their practice on the words of the apostle Paul, Romans vi. 3. *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death*, and thinking that the common form of baptism favoured the doctrine of the trinity. This practice gave the greater alarm, as according to Sozomen, it was agreed by all parties (though I should doubt this with respect to the Eunomians) that they who had not been regularly baptized themselves could not confer a regular baptism on others.

The Eunomians, this writer acknowledges, were in general men of abilities, and excelled in argumentation. He also owns that many persons were pleased with the gravity and severity of discipline in the Eunomian churches. They would have drawn many more, he says, into their opinions, if they had not been opposed by Basil and Gregory of Nazianzum, and if the emperor Theodosius had not banished them from the more agreeable part of the Roman empire, to those that were desert and barbarous*:

Sozomen says that, besides these causes of the suppression of the Eunomian and Apollinarian heresies, the monks contributed not a little to it; for

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 26. p. 253.

for that all those of Syria, Cappadocia, and the neighbouring provinces adhered closely to the Nicene faith. Otherwise, he says, that all the provinces of the East from Cilicia to Phœnicia, would have embraced the Apollinarian heresy; and that the Eunomians were in possession of all the country from Cilicia and mount Taurus to Constantinople. But the common people, holding the monks in great veneration, were easily brought to think that the doctrines which they espoused were right. In like manner the Egyptians ceased to be Arians by adopting the opinions of the monks in their country. Our author then proceeds to give a long account of the more celebrated monks who flourished at this time in Egypt, Thebais, Scetis, Nitria, Rhinocorura, Palestine, Syria, Cœlesyria, Edessa, Galatia, Cappadocia, and other countries*.

Many of the Goths were brought to embrace christianity in the reign of Valens, in consequence of his assisting one party of them against the other; the prince whose part he took embracing the religion of his protector, and recommending it to his subjects. For this reason also these christian Goths were Arians, Valens himself being so. The other branch of the Goths, however continuing heathens,

Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 27, 28. p. 55, &c.

heathens, persecuted the christians, so that many of the Gothic Arians became martyrs.*

Many of the Saracens are also said to have embraced christianity in the latter part of the reign of Valens; and Mavia, a queen among them, agreed to make peace with the Romans, whose territories she had greatly ravaged, on condition that one Moses, a monk, might be permitted to go and settle as a bishop among her subjects†.

The heathen philosophers were much mortified at the firm establishment which christianity had acquired in the reign of Valens, and earnestly wished for another heathen emperor, such as Julian had been. And as the heathens in general, the philosophers themselves by no means excepted, had great faith in divination, a number of them assembled towards the close of this reign, to find out by this art who was to succeed Valens.

For this purpose, as the process is described by Ammianus Marcellinus, a heathen historian, a tripod of laurel was artificially prepared, and consecrated with certain prescribed secret charms and invocations. It was then placed in the middle of a room, perfumed with Arabian spices. The dish, made of different metals, upon which it was set, had

* So crates Hist. Lib. iv, Cap. 33. p. 255.

† Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 36. p. 257. Theod. Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 23, p. 182.

had upon its utmost brim the twenty-four letters of the alphabet, neatly engraved, at due distances from each other. Then a person cloathed in li-
 rien vestments, with linen socks upon his feet, and a suitable covering upon his head, came in with laurel branches in his hands ; and after performing some mystic charms, shook a ring suspended from a rod, about the edge of the dish, which, jumping up and down, rested on certain letters of the alphabet ; the priest at the same time uttering certain heroic verses, in answer to the questions which had been proposed. The letters which the ring pointed out in this case were four, viz. ΘΗΟΔ, which being put together composed these two syllables, ΤΗΕΟΔ, on which one who stood by presently cried out that the oracle plainly intended *Theodorus*. Nor did they make any farther inquiries, being all well satisfied that he was the person intended*.

This Theodorus was a military officer in the emperor's household, and a man of excellent character, though a heathen ; and an earnest wish that he should succeed Valens, with an expectation that the divulging of this oracle, at a proper time, would greatly facilitate their scheme, would probably lead them to impose upon themselves, as well as others, by this mode of inquiry.

These

* Lardner's Testimonies, Vol. iv. p. 355.

These proceedings were, no doubt, intended to be kept secret, but Valens was informed of them; and perhaps not being himself free from superstition, as thinking that dæmons might sometimes be permitted to do very extraordinary things (which indeed was the general opinion of christians in this age) he considered it as an act of treason; and being exceedingly alarmed, and enraged, he put to death all who had been concerned in this business; and not only them, but, as the christian historians say, many other persons in different parts of the empire, whose names began with the four unfortunate letters **THEO**, as Theodotus, Theodosius, Theodulus, &c. But as the heathen historians make no mention of a thing so unreasonable and cruel, Dr. Lardner thinks it undeserving of any credit.

Theodorus, whom the heathens wished to have for an emperor, and whom Ammianus Marcellinus acknowledges to have formed some designs upon the empire (though it does not appear that he had any concern in this business, and probably had no other wish than that of succeeding Valens after his death) was beheaded. Of the diviners themselves, Simonides, a young man, was burned alive, and the philosopher Maximus, the great friend of Julian, who had been consulted upon the occasion, and who disapproved of their proceed-

ings, as an hazardous thing, was beheaded, because he had given no information of it. But what the orthodox historians, probably to blacken the character of Valens, farther add, of his putting to death all the heathen philosophers throughout the empire, and even those who, without being philosophers, had chosen to wear their peculiar habit (so that from this time we hear little or nothing of them) is in the highest degree improbable; and the heathen writers say nothing of any such persecution.

As to the deficiency of heathen philosophers, which is not denied, it may be accounted for from the decline of heathenism in general, and the prevalence of christianity. I would observe, however, on this occasion, that a much more grievous persecution than this of the heathens by Valens, even admitting the most exaggerated account of it, was so far from extinguishing, that it even materially contributed to the spread of christianity. Besides, as it is not said that any of these philosophers had the option of escaping death by becoming christians, they cannot be said to have died proper *martyrs* to their religion, though they should have been put to death in consequence of having made profession of it.

At

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 35, p. 269. Socratis Hist. Lib. iv, Cap. 19, p. 334.

At length Valens died as suddenly as his brother, and much more miserably A. D. 379. For after being defeated in a battle with the barbarians in Thrace, he was burnt, along with his attendants, in a village to which he had fled, and to which the enemy had set fire. He had lived fifty years, and had reigned thirteen along with his brother, and three more after his death*.

Of both these princes Mr. Gibbon says, that
“ they invariably retained in the purple the chaste
“ and temperate simplicity which had adorned
“ their private life ; and under their reign the pleasures of a court never cost the people a blush or
“ a sigh. They gradually reformed many of the
“ abuses of the times of Constantius, judiciously
“ adopted and improved the designs of Julian
“ and his successor, and displayed a style and spirit of legislation which might inspire posterity with
“ the most favourable opinion of their character
“ and government.” Though it is said that they were in a great measure illiterate themselves, they were great promoters of learning. They planned a course of instruction for every city in the empire, and the academies of Rome and Constantinople were considerably extensive, especially the latter†.

With

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 38. p. 259, Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 40. p. 278.

† Hist. Vol. ii, p. 502.

With respect to ability it is acknowledged that Valens was greatly inferior to his brother.

SECTION VI.

State of Sects in this Period.

VALENS was the only proper Arian emperor, as he adopted the tenets of Eunomius, at least always favoured that party, and though it is not credible that he should have been guilty of the horrid cruelties which the orthodox historians lay to his charge, the measures which he took to extirpate what he thought to be heresy, though the same with those which had been adopted by Constantine and Constantius before him, were far from being justifiable. With respect to the heathens, Theodoret says, that he had allowed them to worship in their own way, and waged war with none but those who held the apostolical (by which he meant the Homoeousian) doctrine. During the whole time of that reign the fire burned upon the altars, the Gentiles offered incense and sacrifices to their idols, and held their feasts publicly in the market places.

places. They who were initiated in the rites of Bacchus ran about covered with goat skins, and tearing dogs to pieces, with that wild fury, which was usual in the solemnities of that God*.

In this reign both the Arian and the Trinitarian doctrines were much advanced, the Arians in general being Eunomians, maintained that Christ was properly *a creature*, and of a substance *unlike* that of the Father; and the Trinitarians avowing, what they had not done before, that all the three persons in the trinity were not only *consubstantial*, but likewise in all respects *perfectly equal*, though this doctrine had not as yet acquired the sanction of any council.

I. *Of the Unitarians.*

No mention is made by historians of any Unitarians in this reign. But after being so numerous not long before, it cannot be supposed that no such christians existed. It is probable that some of them, under the name of Paulians, or Photinians, held separate assemblies, and that a great number of the common people, who were Unitarians, continued in communion with the catholic church, in which no subscription was required of them, and no trinitarian liturgies were then used. The casual mention of them by Athanasius and others is a sufficient

* Lardner's Testimonies, Vol. iv. p. 368.

sufficient proof of their existence, and that they were numerous, especially among the lower people, whose behaviour was pacific, and who were beneath the notice of solemn councils. It is of them that Athanasius speaks, when he says, "It grieves those who stand up for the holy faith, that the multitude, and especially persons of low understanding, should be infected with those blasphemies. Things that are sublime and difficult (in which light the pre-existence and divinity of Christ were always exhibited by the ancients) are not to be apprehended except by faith, and ignorant people must fall if they cannot be persuaded to rest in faith, and avoid curious questions*."

We see by this how much even the learned of that age were puzzled with such questions as plain people sometimes put to them about their new and mysterious doctrines, and that they could not reconcile them to what is so plainly taught, and so copiously and forcibly inculcated, in the scriptures, concerning *one God*, and the subordination of Christ, and of all other prophets, to him.

We even see in a period much later than this, viz. the reign of Justinian, that Facundus calls the unitarians the *Grex fidelium*, the common herd of believers, of whom he says, that they were imperfect

* De incarnatione verbi contra Paulum Samosatensem, Opera Vol. i. 591.

felt in the faith, resembling the whole christian church in the time of our Saviour, and till the publication of the gospel of John, when it was acknowledged that christians in general had not attained to more knowledge than that of the humanity of Christ, and were ignorant of his pre-existence and divinity. It may also be collected from Epiphanius, that the unitarians, under more denominations than one were numerous in his time, as they must have been in Africa when Austin wrote, since many things that he advances are pointed against them.

II. *Of the Novations.*

Valens, in his zeal for Arianism, banished from Constantinople the Novatians, who were Confubstantialists, and shut up their churches. He even banished their bishop Agelius, a man, says Socrates, of an apostolical character, who usually walked barefoot, and in a simple tunic. But his anger was softened by Macrianus, a man of religion and address, who had instructed two daughters of Valens in the art of grammar, and who had held a considerable rank in the army near the emperor's person (having probably been of the prætorian guards) but was now a presbyter among the Novatians.

tians. Out of respect to him the churches of the Novatians were again opened*.

The Novatians about this time made a change with respect to the celebration of Easter, for which it is not easy to assign a reason; since both Novatians himself, and all his followers, in every part of the world, had not before made any difficulty of keeping this festival as it had been settled by the council of Nice. But now, in a synod held at Pagus in Phrygia, some of the Novatians agreed to celebrate this festival at the same time with the Jews. This, Socrates says, he had from an old man, the son of a presbyter, and who, together with his father, was present at this synod, though neither Agelius the Novatian bishop of Constantinople, nor Maximus of Nice, nor those of Nicomedia or Cottuzæum, were there; and these were generally considered as at the head of the sect. On account of this synod, however the Novatians were afterwards divided into two parties.†

III. *Of the Donatists.*

It is not a little extraordinary that such people as the catholics represent the Donatists to have been

* Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 9, p. 221.

† Socratis Hist. Lib. iv. Cap. 28, p. 249. Sozomenus Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 24, p. 249.

been, viz. more like heathens than christians, indeed more like brutes than men, should, notwithstanding all measures, whether of gentleness or rigour continue to increase, so that, without the aid of civil power, the Catholics were not able to make head against them.

Valentinian was no more sparing of *wholesome severity*, as in that age it was deemed to be, than any of his predecessors. One law of his is particularly levelled against them and the Manichæans, by which they were declared to be incapable of receiving any public bounty, of making a testament, or disposing of their goods; some were made incapable of inheriting the estates of their fathers, and the slave of a Donatist, forsaking his master obtained his liberty.

Yet under all these discouragements it is acknowledged that the Donatists were exceedingly numerous, and divided among themselves, and their cruelties to each other are said not to have fallen short of those which they exercised against the catholics; Donatus bishop of Bagnia was, in a tumult, thrown into a well, and in another place Marculus was thrown from a high rock. These, and other shocking particulars, are collected by Dr. Long from the writings of Austin*.

* History of the Donatists, p. 77, &c.

In this reign the Donatists held a council at Carthage, where Parmenian was their bishop, in which Ticonius, who was at the head of a party which separated from Donatus, and which this council did not put an end to, attended. This Ticonius had given offence to the other Donatists by his writings, by which he endeavoured to extend the sect of the Donatists beyond the limits of Africa. About this time, also, Parmenian wrote against the catholics, and was answered by Optatus bishop of Milevi, who gives an account of the origin of the Donatists, and describes their customs. But the enormities which he attributes to them are not credible with respect to any people professing christianity. Parmenian had proposed a public conference with the catholic bishops, but he afterwards declined it, alleging that he should be defiled by communication with the impure*.

* Le Sueur Hist. A. D. 368.

S. E. C.

S E C T I O N VII.

Of the Contest for the See of Rome after the Death of Liberius, and the Corruption of the Clergy in the City.

IN this period of my history we have the first remarkable instance of the degree to which the wealth and power annexed to the see of Rome could inflame the passions of men.

On the death of Liberius, A. D. 366, there appeared to be two parties in the church of Rome, the remains, it is said, of those who had favoured him, and of those who had taken the part of Felix. One of these declared for Damasus, who was a native of Spain, and had been attached to Liberius, and the other for Ursicinus. The partisans of each meeting in different churches, they were both elected at the same time, and the people entered so warmly into the contest, that Juventius the præfect thought it necessary to interpose; and, taking the part of Damasus, he sent Ursicinus and his principal adherents into exile. His friends, however, rescued him from the præfect, and conducted him to a church, which the party of Damasus soon be-
set;

set; and forcing the doors, unroofing the building, and setting fire to it, one hundred and thirty persons of both sexes were killed. Ursicinus and his adherents fled, and thus Damasus was established by force.

The partisans of Ursicinus, however, did not cease importuning Valentinian till they obtained an order for their return to the city. But by the influence of Damasus, he was once more expelled, and with many of his adherents he went into Gaul. Others of his friends took possession of a church in the city, and held it till it was taken from them by the civil power*.

Ammianus Marcellinus, who gives an account of this sedition, observes with respect to it, that when he considers the splendour of the city, he does not wonder that the possession of this see was so eagerly contended for; as the successful candidates were sure to be enriched by the oblations of the matrons, they rode richly habited in chariots, and the luxury of their tables exceeded that of kings. "They would be truly happy," he adds, "if, despising the magnificence of the city, they would imitate some of the bishops of provincial towns, whose temperance in eating and drinking, plainness of apparel, and looking above the world, recommended them to the Deity and his
"true"

* Histoire des Papes, Vol. i. p. 223, &c.

“ true worshippers[•].” This is an excellent remark of a heathen, who thus bears testimony to the virtues of those bishops who were removed from such temptations as the opulence of Rome and the greater fees afforded. And in general even those greater bishops were men of virtue.

We see traces of the corruption of some of the christian clergy of this period, in a law of Valentinian, by which those who were called *Continents* were forbidden to enter the houses of widows and minors, or to take any thing from them, or in any manner whatever from women to whom they should have attached themselves on pretence of religion. By this law whatever was given them in this way was to be confiscated. Jerom mentions this law, confessing its reasonableness, but lamenting the occasion of it.

“ It is a shame,” he says, “ that players, charioteers and courtesans, should not be excluded from inheritances, and the clergy and monks should be prohibited to receive them ; and this not by persecutors, but by christian princes. I do not,” says he, “ complain of the law, but grieve that there should have been occasion for it. The cautery is proper, but how came the wound which required it†.”

S E C-

• Lib. 27. p. 362.

† Epist. 2. ad Nepotianum Opera Vol. i, p. 11.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Council of Laodicea.

IT was in this reign, probably A. D. 364, that the council of Laodicea; consisting of about thirty bishops, was held; a council famous for fixing the present canon of the books of scripture, as well as many things relating to church discipline.

It appears by the acts of this council, that many persons still continued to celebrate Easter, on the fourteenth day of the month, according to the custom of the Jews with respect to their passover. Also the Agapes, or love feasts, had continued in some churches, as they were now expressly forbidden.

In this council the invocation of angels is condemned as idolatrous. This custom, which is alluded to by the apostle Paul, Col. ii, 18. Theodoret says, continued long in Phrygia and Pisidia; and that therefore it was condemned at this synod which was held in Phrygia. Still, however, he says there may be seen in that country, and others contiguous to it, oratories of St. Michael. These people, he says, worshipped in this manner out of humility, thinking the supreme Being to be inaccessible

cessible to them, but that he might be rendered propitious by the mediation of angels*. Little was it then foreseen to what a height this species of idolatry would arise in a later period, and that the number of christian *mediators with God* would in time exceed that of the heathen deities, that this worship would be carried on the same forms, and would engross almost all the devotion of the christian world. We have had examples of persons requesting the prayers of martyrs, when they should be in heaven, but those requests were made to them before they died. As yet we have no example of any address made to them after they were dead. About this time, however, it was the custom of women to offer cakes on certain days to the virgin Mary, from which they got the name of *Collyridians*, a custom which Epiphanius says prevailed in Arabia, but originated in Thrace, and the upper Scythia. But this custom did not extend far, and was generally condemned†.

By the decrees of this council we perceive that the fast which preceded the celebration of Easter was much extended; so as to take in three weeks. So strict was this fast, that by this council the administration of the eucharist was forbidden in it, as also the anniversaries of the martyrs, except on
Saturdays

* Opera Vol. iii. p. 358.

† Hær. 79. Opera, Vol. i. p. 1057.

Saturdays and Sundays, because these days were always considered as festivals : for the same reason marriages were also forbidden during this fast*.

S E C T I O N IX.

Of the Writers in the Time of Valens.

ONE of the principal writers, as well as actors, in ecclesiastical matters from the time of Constantine, to that of Valens (for in these later periods, I do not propose to notice them all) was Athanasius of Alexandria, whose history has been given already. He was by no means what we should now call *a writer by profession*, since almost every thing that he wrote was on some particular occasion, either in defence of himself, or against his adversaries. Consequently almost all his writings relate to the Arian controversy. We have, however, besides his writings of this class, a work of his against the Gentiles, and the life of the monk Anthony, to whom he was particularly attached ; a work which, like other lives of monks, bears the marks

* Binnii Concilia, Vol. i, p. 241.

marks of great credulity and superstition, as will be seen in the particular account that I shall give of it in a separate section.

There were several hermits of the name of Marcellinus, and it is uncertain to which of them we owe the tracts which are come down to us under this name; but there are fifty homilies addressed to the monks, and rules for a monastic life.

Of Hilary bishop of Poitiers much hath been said in the preceding history. He was a strenuous defender of the doctrine of the trinity, on which subject we have a large treatise of his in twelve books. He also wrote a treatise on synods, and some commentaries on the scriptures. Besides these, we have some fragments of his collected by another person, and which are of great use with respect to the history of those times.

Notwithstanding the numerous writings of Apollinaris, nothing now remains of his besides a translation of the psalms into verse. The works relating to his particular opinions are all lost; and on this occasion Dupin says, that the Catholics had so great a horror of the books of heretics, that they would not preserve even those of them which did not relate to their heresy, and which might have been useful to the church.

Cyril of Jerusalem has left a number of catechetical, and also of mystigogical lectures, the former addressed to catechumens, and the other to persons lately baptized.

We have a Greek translation of the works of Ephrem the Syrian, a deacon of Edessa, consisting of moral discourses. They were so much admired as to be read in many churches after the scriptures. This writer was born in the reign of Constantine. He very early embraced the monastic life, and was much esteemed by Basil.

Basil, surnamed *the great*, of whom an account was given in the preceding history, was one of the most considerable writers of his age. We have of his a treatise on the work of the six days, thirty on homilies on other subjects; two books on baptism, a commentary on the the first sixteen chapters of Isaiah, five books against Eunomius, and of monastic constitutions. But the most curious and valuable of his remains are about four hundred *letters*, which give us a clear idea of the history of his times; on which account Dupin proposed to give a translation of them into French. It is indeed very much to be wished that there were translations of them into the modern languages.

About 370 Basil composed forms of prayer,
and

and rules for the decent performance of the communion service, which, by the consent of the bishop Eusebius, were used at Cæsarea in Cappadocia. *Bingham* p. 605.

His brother Gregory of Nyssa wrote on subjects similar to those of Basil, viz. several pieces relating to the doctrine of the trinity against Eunomius, on the work of the six days, and many miscellaneous tracts.

Gregory of Nazianzum, the great friend of Basil, distinguished himself so much by his writings on the subject of the trinity, that he got the name of *Theologus*. He also wrote against Julian, by which means many fragments of the work of that emperor against christianity have been preserved, and several miscellaneous tracts.

Epiphanius, a native of Palestine, and bishop of Salamis in Crete, of whom some mention will be made in the next reign, in which he died at a very advanced age, was the author of many works, the principal of which are still extant, viz. *Ancoratus*, or a discourse concerning faith against the Macedonians, on weights and measures a large work against heresies, and an epitome of the same. Of these he enumerates not less than eighty. Though he is in many respects a credulous writer, this work of his is upon the whole very valuable.

To

56 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. X.

To this period I must refer the spurious work which bears the title of *Apostolical Constitutions*, drawn up in the name of the apostles, who are represented as employing Clement for their secretary. They are first quoted by Epiphanius, and are of use to give us an idea of the opinions, but still more of the practices, which prevailed in what was called the catholic church of this period.

PERIOD

P E R I O D XI.

FROM THE DEATH OF VALENS. A. D. 378, TO
THAT OF THEODOSIUS, A. D. 395.

S E C T I O N I.

Of the State of Things at the Accession of Theodosius, and his Determination in Favour of what was deemed the Orthodox Faith.

WE are now come to a reign very similar to that of Constantine, viz. that of an emperor who, like him, was successful in war, zealous for the christian religion, and who employed all his power to support what he held to be the orthodox part of it. It is to his interference that we owe the present general reception of the doctrine of the trinity, and its having ever since made a part of all the civil establishments of christianity. Socrates, in his introduction to the history of this reign, says that from the time that the emperors became christians, ecclesiastical matters were regulated by them, and

and that the greatest councils decided according to to their pleasure*. This, indeed, is sufficiently evident from the plainest facts, without the explicit confession of this honest historian.

The emperor that I refer to was *Theodosius*, descended from an honourable family in Spain (like Constantine, often surnamed *the great*) who upon the death of Valens was raised to the empire by Gratian from the opinion that he had of his merit, without regard to any other consideration; an opinion which his able and upright conduct abundantly justified. To him Gratian assigned the government of the East, while he retained that of the West, or rather a part of it, viz. Britain, Gaul, and Spain; leaving to his younger brother Valentinian II. the government of Italy, Illyricum, and Africa.

Before the arrival of Theodosius, the care of the whole empire devolved upon Gratian, who to his other virtues added those of a very good commander. Had Valens waited till he had come to his assistance, when he was hastening to join him, it is probable that he would not have met with his unhappy fate, which threw Constantinople itself into the greatest consternation. The Goths, however, were repulsed by a vigorous effort of the inhabitants, aided by the Saracens under the queen Ma-
via

* Socratis Hist. Lib. v. p. 263.

via mentioned before: And Gratian soon after concluded a peace with them.

At the same time Gratian restored to their sees all the bishops who had been banished by Valens, and gave liberty to all sects of christians; but as he excepted the Manichæans, Photinians, and Eunomians, none but the Novatians, and the more moderate Arians, at that time commonly called Macedonians, could derive any benefit from the toleration*,

At this time the Arians, i. e. the Eunomians, were in possession of all the churches of the East, except that of Jerusalem, which was under Cyril. But the Macedonians, after their agreement with Liberius and the Consubstantialists, to which they had been driven by the persecution of the Eunomians, held no separate assemblies till after this law of Gratian. Taking advantage of it, some of them recovered the sees from which they had been expelled; and forming a synod at Antioch, they decreed that the Son was not of *the same*, but only of *like* substance with the Father. Many of their body, however, thinking this to be a factious measure, quitted their communion, and adhered to that of the Consubstantialists. Some of the bishops who were at liberty by this law of Gratian

to

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 1. p. 279. Socratis Hist. Lib. v, Cap. 1, 2. p. 264.

to return to their sees, were not solicitous about it; but having experienced the mischiefs of dissension, were content to live in communion with the churches which they had formerly governed*.

... In consequence of this law of Gratian, Meletius returned to Antioch, and Paulinus being then very old, it was, after much contention, agreed, that the whole church should be governed by the survivor of them; and in the mean time Meletius went to reside at Constantinople†.

Theodosius, arriving in the East, was as successful in his wars against the barbarians as Gratian was in the West. Whether the latter had a view to any other qualifications than those of a soldier, a christian, and an honest man, is not said; but it soon appeared that Theodosius was as zealous a Confessionalist as himself. In common with Constantine, Constantius, and other eminent persons of that age, he had not been baptized; but being taken ill at Thessalonica, and finding that Alcholius the bishop of that city was a Confessionalist, he chose to be baptized by him; and upon his recovery he published a law to oblige all his subjects, to profess the doctrine of the Nicene creed

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 2, p. 280. Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 4, p. 265.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 3. p. 281. Socratis Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 5. p. 266.

creed, and ordered that all the churches in which it was not professed should be considered as heretical*. Accordingly, on his arrival at Constantinople, he gave Demophilus the Arian bishop the choice of quitting his profession, or the city ; and chusing the latter, he and his followers assembled in a church without the gates. Thus, says our historian, the Arians were expelled from the city of Constantinople, after they had kept possession of it forty years†. He was succeeded by Gregory of Nazianzum.

The Homoousian party, however, were apprehensive of the Arians, and especially of Eunomius, on account of his great powers of persuasion. For as he lived as a private person in Bythinia, many resorted to him from Constantinople ; and the emperor himself expressed a wish to have an interview with him ; but he was diverted from his purpose by his wife Flacilla, who dreaded the consequences of it.

It is said that Theodosius was confirmed in the trinitarian doctrine, by the address of Amphilo- chius, an old bishop, who suspecting him of wavering in his opinion, after saluting him with all due respect as the emperor, behaved with

VOL. II.

X x

unbecoming

* Sozomini Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 4, p. 282.

† Socratis Hist. Lib. v, Cap. 7, p. 268. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 5, p. 283.

unbecoming freedom to his *son*. The emperor being offended at this, the old man said he did it on purpose that he might give him some idea of the displeasure which their heavenly Father would conceive against [those who did not worship his son as they did himself]. At this time, however, the emperor's son had not the title of *Augustus*, and therefore the old bishop's example was not in point, if his intention was to inculcate the doctrine of the perfect equality of the Son to the Father. This story is referred by Theodoret to a later period in the history, viz. till after the return of Theodosius from the defeat of Maximus†. But neither of the sons of Theodosius was emperor till after his death.

SECTION II.

Of the Council of Constantinople A. D. 381.

THE emperor, being now confirmed in his own opinion, called a council, as Sozomen says, of the bishops of his own communion, both to establish

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 6. p. 284.

† Lib. 7, Cap. 16, p. 214.

SECT. II. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 268

establish the decrees of the council of Nice, and to elect a bishop for the church of Constantinople; many persons having complained of Gregory, the friend of Basil, as having been brought to them from a distance; but many more were, no doubt, dissatisfied with him on account of his high trinitarian principles, as his church had been in the possession of the Arians forty years.

Theodosius, however, hoping to gain the Macedonians, as they did not differ much from the catholics, permitted their bishops to attend. Accordingly, there were assembled about one hundred and fifty Consubstantialists, and twenty six of the Macedonians, the latter chiefly from the cities in the neighbourhood of the Hellespont, and at the head of them were Eleusius of Cyzicum, and Marcianus of Lampfacum. Among the Consubstantialists, Timothy bishop of Alexandria presided.

When they were assembled, the emperor, and the bishops of his own persuasion, did every thing in their power to prevail upon the Macedonians, to concur with them in subscribing the Homoeousian doctrine, reminding them of their having voluntarily done so, when, in the former reign, they had applied to Liberius, and after that time had made no difficulty of continuing in communion with them. But they could not be prevailed upon;

upon; and leaving Constantinople, they wrote to their friends, exhorting them to adhere to their principles, and never to consent to the doctrine of the Nicene creed. From this it is evident, that they had sufficiently repented of their former compliance, and even that the persecution which they must have expected from Theodosius would not induce them to act the part that they had done in the time of Valens.

The bishops of the Homoousian party being now alone, chose Nectarius a layman, and a person of senatorial rank, for bishop of Constantinople. At the time of his election he was not even baptized, though pretty far advanced in years. But, like Ambrose, who in circumstances very similar to his had been made bishop of Milan, not being able to decline the honour that was offered him, he first went through all the forms of baptism, wearing a dress proper for the purpose, according to the custom of that age, and after other necessary steps was regularly ordained bishop. Gregory, whose ordination had been much objected to by Timothy of Alexandria, and by the oriental bishops in general, made no objection to their proceedings, and peaceably departed for Nazianzum*.

Nectarius,

* It might be in part from resentment of his treatment in this council, that this Gregory, being afterwards invited to attend one, said that he avoided all assemblies

Nectarius, being now bishop of Constantinople, joined his brethren, who remained after the Arian bishops had left the place, as a member of this celebrated council, the second in rank after that of Nice; having like it, obtained the title of *œcumenical*, or *universal*, though it consisted of no more than one hundred and fifty bishops.

The first thing of any importance that was done in this council was to confirm the doctrine of the Nicene creed, adding, as if it had been a necessary consequence of it, that the three persons in the trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, were *equal in power and glory*. This they called confirming the doctrine of Nice. But it is a remarkable instance of persons imposing upon themselves with respect to the antiquity of their opinions. For it was going much farther than the Nicene Fathers had any idea of, and what they would have unanimously disclaimed.

They of bishops, that he had never known any of them to terminate well, and that so far had they been from removing any evils, they had increased them; that their contention and love of power were not to be described, *Epist. xlii. Opera, p. 814.* The observation however is very true, and will apply to all the councils, of which we have a sufficiently distinct account. But the same is the case with the assemblies of other men, whose views and interests interfere.

They believed the Son to be *of the same substance* with the Father, but they had by no means any such idea with respect to the Holy Spirit, and still less would they have thought of making either the Son, or the Holy Spirit, *equal* to the Father. Now, however, this doctrine, which has been the standard of orthodoxy ever since, was first confirmed by the authority of a general council, after having been advanced, and contended for, in the writings of the more zealous divines. It was also determined, that no churches should remain in possession of any bishops who did not hold this new doctrine*.

It likewise appears from the synodical letter of this council, which is preserved in Theodoret, that the doctrine of Apollinaris, viz. of Christ having taken only *flesh* of the Virgin, and not having a proper human soul, was condemned in it. Damasus bishop of Rome, and a synod of bishops assembled there, joined this council at Constantinople in the condemnation of this doctrine, and in the excommunication of Apollinaris himself and Timotheus his disciple. They also anathematized those who said that the Holy Spirit was made by the Son, or that he is not of the same power and substance with the Father

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 7, 8. p. 258. Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 7, 8. p. 267.

Father and the Son ; and in a separate condemnation of all heresies, they insert the opinion ascribed to Apollinaris, of the divine nature of the Son suffering, and not his body and soul only. This writing contains the highest orthodoxy of the age, expressed in the most definite and unequivocal language, very similar to that of the Athanasian creed (as it is now called) as it particularly condemns those who say that, in consequence of acknowledging the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, separately considered, to be each of them properly *God*, there will then be *three Gods*, and not *one God*, only*.

In this council a new distribution was made of the dioceses, because in the late persecution much confusion had been introduced with respect to the former regulations. To the bishop of Constantinople was assigned the city, and province the of Thrace, to the bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, was given Pontus, &c. It is to be observed that these *dioceses*, as they were called, were not under the jurisdiction of *bishops* as such, but of metropolitan bishops, being the bishops of the chief towns and provinces. In that age a bishop is never said to have had the government of more than one *church*, or *parish*, though it sometimes consisted of several congregations. But the bishops of these metropolitan

* Theod H. Lib. v, Cap. 10. p. 209.

litan sees presided over whole provinces, in which were many bishops*.

No person can give any attention to this council, and imagine that there was any thing like freedom of discussion in it. The emperor assembled only those bishops who he thought would concur with him in fixing such a creed as he approved, and in doing every thing else that he wished them to do; and they were not half the number that Constantine in a much earlier period of the christian history had assembled at Nice. Theodosius would not have invited the Macedonians to attend this council, but with the hope of persuading them to join the other bishops; and as soon as this appeared to be impracticable, they were dismissed. This being so soon after the time of Valens, who had assembled several councils of Arian bishops, and much more numerous than this, there can be no doubt but that, if Theodosius had been so disposed, he might very easily have brought together more bishops than he did upon this occasion, to fix almost any other creed that he should have thought proper.

That the bishops assembled in council had any supernatural direction in forming their decrees, does not seem to have been imagined in this age.

All
* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 9. p. 288. Socratia Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 8. p. 268.

All that they pretended to was to declare what in their opinion, had been the faith of their ancestors; and in ascertaining this, they did not proceed in any regular method of inquiry into the state of opinions in former times, but decided according to their *own* opinions, which were formed under the influences that have been described.

S E C T I O N III.

Other Endeavours of Theodosius to support the Catholic Faith.

THIS zealous and well disposed emperor, unwilling to give up his favourite project of uniting all christians in one common faith had recourse to another method of gaining his end. He summoned the heads of all the different sects, thinking that, by conferring amicably together, they might come to some agreement. But Nestorius, the newly chosen bishop of Constantinople, and Agelius the bishop of the Novatians in that city, who were both Consubstantialists, after discoursing together on the subject, advised the emperor not to permit the different sectaries to dis-

pute together ; since no differences had ever been composed by that means, but had always been the more inflamed, They therefore wished that he would propose to them whether they would abide by the opinions of those christians who wrote before the origin of the late differences, thinking that, if they agreed to put the matter upon this issue, they might easily be confuted, and if they refused, they would be excommunicated by their own churches.

Accordingly, this proposal was made to them by the emperor, and a proper time was allowed them to give their answers. But upon this they were divided, some thinking the proposal a reasonable one, and others the contrary, especially as they entertained different opinions concerning the ancient writers ; but upon this occasion not only did the heads of the several sects differ from each other, but even those who were of the same sect. Thus the scheme of these two bishops proved to be no better than that of the emperor. He therefore tried another of his own.

Finding that the heads of the different sects could not come to any agreement with respect to their answer to his question, he in the next place, desired them to bring their several creeds in writing. Accordingly, one was presented by Demophilus, on the part of the Arians ; another by Eunosomius

SECT. III. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 371

nomius himself, on the part of his sect ; and another by Eleusius of Cyzicum, on the part of the Macedonians. For the Arians, it seems, were now divided into three parties, though it is not said in what respects those who are here called *Arians*, and *Macedonians*, differed from each other ; but the latter were properly Consubstantialists with respect to the Son, though not so with respect to the Holy Spirit. Whether any more creeds were produced is not said. These, however, the emperor took with him into his closet ; and having prayed fervently that God would enable him to discern the truth, he read them carefully over, and then, as the historian says, condemning all that made a division in the trinity, he adopted the Consubstantial faith only ; and as the Novatians held this faith, he allowed their congregations the same privileges as those of the catholic churches.

As it is not said that the emperor received any answer to his prayer (which could only be ascertained by some miracle) it is evident that this decision, however carefully and piously formed, was only his own private opinion, and therefore certainly of no more authority than that of any other person. It is evident, however, that the emperor had not perfect confidence in the decision of his council. For if he had, this kind of appeal to heaven would

would have been superfluous. As to the leaders of those sects whose creeds the emperor had rejected, the historian says that they went home much chagrined, but comforted their adherents on the occasion, and on the defection of their friends, by saying that *many were called, but few chosen* ; a doctrine which they had not preached when they were the majority.

The emperor, thinking that he had now done all that was in his power to promote uniformity of opinion by *peaceable methods*, had recourse to *force*. For by a law he enacted on this occasion, he forbade all who had been declared *heretics*, to hold any assemblies for public worship, to teach their opinions, or to ordain bishops.* Some he banished from the cities, and others from the empire itself ; and some he branded with infamy, excluding them from all the rights of citizens. But the historian says that, though he annexed heavy punishments to the breach of these laws, he was not rigorous in exacting them, hoping to bring the sectaries into the pale of his church by terror, as well as by rewards ; for he greatly favoured

* By the Theodosian code, if any heretic ordained a cleric, or himself received the office, he was fined ten pounds of gold, and the place in which it was performed was confiscated. This was enforced by Honorius against the Donatists. *Bingham* ii. 26.

vowed those who came over of their own accord*.

Notwithstanding the enacting of laws which denounced the penalty of death on certain heretics, there is hardly any instance of its being put in execution before the case of Priscillian.

This history is a very instructive one, shewing how ineffectual are all schemes to produce uniformity of opinion in a short time. But we may be confident that, without the interference of any authority, this will be the natural consequence of free discussion, with respect to every question of importance, in a due course of time. It is in vain for men to attempt to accelerate the course of nature. Truth is sure to prevail, and every thing that reasonable men desire will be gained; but sufficient time must be allowed for the purpose.

During these proceedings at Constantinople Maximus declared himself emperor in Britain; and in opposing him Gratian lost his life, after a reign of fifteen years; but from the death of his father not quite eight years†. But Theodosius marching

* Soeratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 10. p. 272. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 12, p. 292.

† Gratian had been educated with the greatest care by his father Valentinian, and was in all respects an accomplished prince. He was deserted by his troops who thought he gave too much preference to strangers.

marching against him, his own soldiers delivered him up, and he was put to death.

While this war was carrying on, two attempts were made in favour of Arianism, one in the East, and the other in the West. In the absence of Theodosius, and upon a rumour of his ill success, the Arians in Constantinople made an insurrection, in which the house of Nestorius was burned down.

In the West, Justina the wife of Valentinian, who was an Arian, but who had no power while her husband was living, endeavoured, by influencing her son, to expel Ambrose from the see of Milan ; but the people took the part of the bishop and prevented it. Notwithstanding this, it is said, she made a law, by which all who did not subscribe the creed of Ariminum should be expelled from their churches, and be punished with death. News however arriving of the death of Gratian, a stop was put to her proceedings. As Socrates says nothing of this law to enforce the creed of Ariminum,

He concurred with Theodosius in all measures to suppress what they deemed to be heresy. On the death of Gratian, Valentinian II. remained sole emperor of the West. Both of them were governed by Ambrose, the orthodox bishop of Milan, in all matters relating to religion. Gratian was the first of the christian emperors who refused the title of *Pontifex Maximus*.

num, and only mentions the attempts of Justina to banish Ambrose, it is probable that this was all that she aimed at. Indeed the other project would have been absurd in the extreme*.

Those who apostatized from the christian religion were by the laws of Theodosius deprived of the rights of Roman citizens, and of that of disposing of their estates by will. And Valentinian the younger took from them the benefit of receiving legacies, or succeeding to any inheritance. *Bingham* ii. 97.

S E C T I O N IV.

Transactions of a mixed nature, civil and religious, with an Account of Theodosius's Death and Character.

WHILE Theodosius was employed in the East, Valentinian the younger was as unfortunate in the West as Gratian had been. For Eugenius

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 13. p. 293. Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 11, 13. p. 276. 279. Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 13, p. 212.

genius and Arbogastes, conspiring against him, put him to death. Upon this Theodosius marched into the West, leaving both his sons in Constantinople, and defeated Eugenius near Aquileia ; and when this usurper threw himself at the feet of Theodosius, his guards who were apprehensive that their master would spare his life, without waiting for his orders, dispatched him. Arbogastes killed himself.

While Theodosius was preparing for this war, it was found necessary to lay heavier taxes on the people than usual ; and this was the occasion of a very alarming insurrection at Antioch, where the populace threw down the statues of the emperor and empress, and dragged them about the streets. The emperor hearing of this, and being naturally hasty, gave orders for the slaughter of many of the inhabitants, which, when they were recovered from their fury, threw them into the greatest consternation. Flavianus their bishop interceded for them in vain ; but some doleful supplicating songs having been composed on the occasion, some young men (who were used to entertain the emperor by singing while he was at meals) were gained to sing some of them ; and Theodosius was so affected by them, that he burst into tears, and pardoned the people. But according to Theodoret (who places this story after the subsequent one concerning Thessa-

Thessalonica) the emperor was pacified by the remonstrances of Macedonius a monk, who represented to him, that, if he was so much offended at the indignity offered to his lifeless statues, much more would God be offended at the violence which he was about to commit on his living images. Brazen statues, he said, might be replaced, but he could not reproduce a single hair of any man whom he should put to death*.

Unfortunately, another case of provocation occurred, in which Theodosius did not check his resentment in time, and the effects were indeed dreadful. Butherius the governor of Thessalonica had apprehended a celebrated charioteer for attempting an unnatural crime ; but as he was much wanted for the chariot races, which were at hand, the populace were very clamorous for his release, and the officer not thinking proper to yield to their intreaties, they grew tumultuous, and at length killed him. The emperor hearing of this was in a great rage, and ordered a party of soldiers to put to death a certain number of the people whom they should first meet with, without making any distinction ; and in consequence of this rash order, a great slaughter was made in the city ; and

VOL. II.

Z z

many

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 23. p. 313. Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 20, p. 240.

many of the sufferers being innocent persons, their cases excited particular compassion.

Ambrose bishop of Milan being informed of this, when the emperor, after his victory over Eugenius, was about to go into the church in that city, he resolutely forbade him, as having his hands polluted with innocent blood; and the emperor, having probably repented of his rashness before, was not offended with his freedom, but withdrew, full of shame and repentance. He afterwards made a public confession of his sin, as other penitents did, and was not admitted to communion till after the usual term of penance, and in all that time he refrained from wearing the purple robe. As a part of his penance enjoined by the bishop, he made a law that all capital punishments should be deferred till thirty days after the orders given for them. This story does great honour both to the bishop and the emperor. He could not be a bad man who, though he committed so great a fault, was capable of acknowledging it in this manner. Ambrose also distinguished himself by his ordering that the emperors, when they were at church, should not sit, as they had been used to do in order to be the more conspicuous, within the rails of the chancel, but before them, among the people; a custom

custom which Sozomen says was observed ever after*.

Theodosius made several regulations in favour of public virtue. At Constantinople there had been persons who made a trade of selling prostitutes, and the practice had been tolerated on account of the advantage which the revenue had derived from it. This, however, the emperor put a stop to as soon as he was acquainted with it; and Florentius the præfect of the prætorian guards, seeing the loss which would thence accrue to the treasury, sold an estate of his own to make it good†.

During the short time that Theodosius was in Italy, he greatly benefited the city of Rome, in part by his liberalities, but chiefly by removing two great nuisances, the discovery of one of which was accidental, but very fortunate. There was in the city a large building where bread was made to be distributed to the citizens, and being near some public stews, strangers were by this means often decoyed into it, and being seized upon were compelled to work all their lives under ground. One of Theodosius's soldiers fell into this snare; but drawing his sword, and killing those who would have

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 25. p. 315. Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 17, 18. p. 215.

† Sueur, .D. 439.

have detained him, he made his escape; and the emperor being informed of it ordered all the persons who had been concerned in this horrid business to be punished as they deserved, and the place to be demolished.

It had been a custom in one part of Rome that women convicted of adultery, should be exposed to prostitution with any persons who chose to have commerce with them. This indecency was also forbidden by Theodosius, and other more proper punishments provided for the case*.

Theodosius continued some time at Milan after the reduction of Eugenius, and finding himself indisposed (Philostorgius says his disease was a dropsy †) sent for his son Honorius from Constantinople. On his arrival he found himself better, and intended to have presided at the Circensian games which were to be exhibited on the occasion of his victory; but being worse after dinner, he desired his son to preside, and in the night following he died, A. D. 395, in the sixtieth year of his age, and the seventeenth of his reign, leaving two sons of the same religious persuasion with himself, of whom Arcadius, the elder, reigned in the East, and Honorius, the younger in the West. Addressing himself to his sons just before his death, he exhorted

* Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 18. p. 284.

† Hist. Lib. ii, Cap. 2. p. 538.

horted them not only as individuals, but as emperors, to cultivate sincere piety. "By this," said he "peace is maintained and war extinguished. By this enemies are dispersed, and victories acquired*."

Several circumstances in the history of Theodosius discover much true greatness of mind. He was raised to the empire without any endeavours of his own, by the mere opinion of his merit and ability ; an opinion which was abundantly justified by his subsequent conduct. By his ability as a warrior he saved the state, and he was the steady friend of Gratian, who called him to partake of the empire, and to his family after him, without ever seeming to wish for more power than was allotted to him. He very properly revenged the death of his benefactors ; but if Maximus would have been content with his success against Gratian, he would have divided the empire with him rather than risque the injuring of it by a civil war.

If Theodosius had the virtues, he had also the faults of Constantine ; or rather he fell into the same *mistake*, in thinking it his duty to support the right faith by civil power. But this had been done

* Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 26, p. 304. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 29. p. 322. Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 25. p. 228.

done without any censure by all the christian emperors before him, except Jovian, who did not live long enough fully to declare himself; and all who followed him trod in the same steps. Indeed, the late reformers from popery did not think it right to leave truth unsupported by civil power. It is much to be lamented that this idea, which has been productive of so much evil, should ever have been taken up, and should have been acted upon so long. But the most enlightened of the present age cannot suppose that even themselves would have judged, or acted, otherwise than great and wise men did in this early period.

Theodosius was in some respects more tolerant than some of the bishops of his age. For when the monks of Callinica in the East, who had been disturbed in their devotions by some Jews, had, in revenge, burned their synagogue, he ordered the Count of the East to rebuild it at his own expence; though by a letter, and the personal application of Ambrose, he was induced to revoke the order*.

As far as appears, Theodosius, to all the ability of a great general, added a constant desire to administer the affairs of the empire in the best manner, without being drawn aside by private gratification, or personal resentment. That he
had

* Vita Ambrosii, Opera Vol. i, p. 54.

had strong passions, from which perhaps no truly *great man* (by which I here mean a man of great energy of mind, and a capacity for public business) was ever wholly exempt, is evident from the history of what passed with respect to Antioch and Thessalonica. But in both cases he had great provocation, and his offence was followed by sincere repentance. From the idea that I have of the character of Julian, if he had reigned half so long as Theodosius did, he would have been capable of much greater cruelties, and without repenting of them.

Philostorgius says that Theodosius was addicted to intemperance, and that the disorder of which he died was brought on by it*. But the orthodox historians praise him for his sobriety and moderation; saying that in these respects he was the reverse of Trajan, whom he greatly resembled in most other particulars, and even in his person.

* Hist. Lib, xi, Cap. 2. p. 539.

SECTION V.

Of Heathenism in this Period.

TILL this reign it is remarkable that the heathens had made no attempts to restore their worship, but had seen the destruction of many of their temples, and the prohibition of their sacrifices and festivals, with silent indignation. But the zeal of Theophilus bishop of Alexandria in executing the orders of Theodosius, to destroy the temples, in that city, provoked them beyond their usual forbearance, or any prudent regard to consequences.

On the request of the bishop, a temple of Bacchus had been converted into a christian church ; and when the secret places of this temple were laid open, the bishop made a public spectacle of whatever was found in them, and especially of some *Phalli*. This ridiculous exhibition of the symbols of their worship the heathen inhabitants could not bear ; but suddenly rushing upon the christians, they killed and wounded many, and then took possession of the temple of Serapis, situated on an eminence ; and falling from that place, as
from

from a fortress, they seized many christians, and when they refused to sacrifice, cruelly tortured them. They even crucified some, and put others to different kinds of death.

The magistrates then interposed, and would have persuaded the people to leave the temple, and cease from hostilities. But this made them the more insolent; and Olympius, a philosopher, encouraged them to persist, and die fighting for their religion. And when they were discouraged at the havoc that was made of their images, he told them that the images were perishable things, but that the divinity which resided in them went up to heaven, and could not be hurt. They therefore remained in the temple, and nothing was done to molest them till the emperor's orders were received. In the mean time great numbers of the heathens, alarmed at what they had done, fled to different places, Olympius to Italy, and two grammarians, Helladius and Ammonius, to Constantinople, where Socrates the historian says that he attended their lectures when he was a young man.

At length the orders of Theodosius arrived, and they were those of a truly christian emperor. He freely pardoned all who had been concerned in the disturbance, hoping that by [this generosity he might gain them over to the christian religion; but he ordered all the heathen temples, without

distinction to be totally demolished. In doing this the statues were converted into vessels for the use of the church of Alexandria. But Theophilus preserved one of them, that it might be occasionally exposed in public, lest the heathens should deny that they ever had had such objects of worship. This Ammonius took very ill, as it was preserved, he said, for no other purpose than to turn his religion into ridicule*.

In some other places also besides Alexandria the heathens at this time fought for their religion, as the people of Petra and Acropolis in Arabia, those of Raphia and Gaza in Palestine, and those of Heliopolis in Phenice. In Syria the people of Apamea, on the river Axius, commonly made use of a garrison of the people of Galilee, and other country people from the villages about mount Libanus for the defence of their temples ; and Marcellus the bishop of the place lost his life in consequence of an over zealous and imprudent attempt to put an end to their worship.

Hearing that the most considerable of their temples was in Aulon, a district of Apamea, he took a company of soldiers and gladiators, in order to demolish it ; but being himself lame, he remained

* Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 16. p. 281. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 15. p. 296. Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 23, p. 223.

mained at some distance till the business should be done. But while his people were busy in demolishing the temple, the heathens, seeing him alone, rushed upon him, and burned him alive. For some time the perpetrators of this murder were unknown, but afterwards they were discovered, and the sons of Marcellus were desirous of revenging their Father's death. But a synod of the province forbade it, alleging that it was not reasonable to require any satisfaction for his death, when both the deceased himself, and his children and friends had cause to give thanks for it, since he had the honour of dying in the cause of God.*

It is evident from the fact of these temples and images having been suffered to remain so long undisturbed, that the orders of the preceding emperors for the demolition of such things had not been executed with rigour. The heathen worship was kept up in so many places, that if there had been any thing fascinating in it, it might have had its full effect. But every exhibition of the heathen worship after the promulgation of christianity only tended to expose it to ridicule. The same advantage, we need not doubt, all truth, and good sense, will have in time over error and absurdity; and the corruptions of christianity, when they are fairly

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 15. p. 298. Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 21. p. 221.

ly exhibited, will fall before the pure and genuine doctrines of it, as heathenism did before christianity itself,

A more peaceable attempt was in this period made at Rome, countenanced by a person of the highest reputation, though a heathen, to restore some of the ceremonies of heathenism in that city. I mean the request that was made by the senate and presented by Symmachus, to Valentinian the younger, during the usurpation of Eugenius, to replace the image and altar of victory, which had been fixed before the senate house, and at which the senators had been accustomed to swear allegiance to the emperor when they entered upon their office. Constantius, when he was at Rome A. D. 356, or 357, had ordered this altar to be removed; but, having been restored by Julian, it had continued till it was again removed by Gratian A. D. 382; when he likewise seized the lands which had been allotted for the maintenance of the priests and the sacrifices, and abrogated the privileges of the vestal virgins.

Complaints were made on the subject; but Gratian paid no regard to them. But not long after his death the senate sent this deputation to Valentinian the younger; and it may not be amiss to consider what was alleged by so able a man as Symmachus in favour of heathenism, in so late a period.

SECT. V. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 889

period. And very happily we have this petition intire, so that we can satisfy ourselves that it contains nothing that any reasonable man can now think deserving of attention. The amount of the whole is, that heathenism was the religion of their ancestors, and that the empire flourished by its means. Speaking in the person of Rome, he says, "let me live in my own way, I am free, and have a right to be so. This way of worship has brought all the world into obedience to my laws. These rites drove Hannibal from my walls, and the Gauls from the capitol. And have I lived so long to be corrected in my old age? Let me know what this new institution is? Sure I am that to reclaim old age is an unreasonable, and dishonourable undertaking."

This petition likewise mentions a general famine, as having followed the confiscation of the revenues which had been appropriated to the maintenance of those ceremonies. But to this it was justly replied by Ambrose, and others who opposed the petition, that the religion of Rome had been greatly changed since the time of Romulus, and that it was highly reasonable that the world should be allowed to grow wiser. As to the famine, it was only local, and did not afflict the whole empire; and such calamities had been frequent in all times.

times. Accordingly no regard was paid to this petition.

In A. D. 388 it is supposed another petition was made to Theodosius, to procure the restoration of this altar of victory, and that this request also was supported by Symmachus. But it had no more effect than the former. However, in A. D. 392, which was after the death of Valentinian, Eugenius restored this altar; and at this time, as this usurper was disposed to favour the heathens, their expectations were greatly raised; victims were multiplied in Rome, all kinds of divination were practiced, and Flavianus the præfect of the city, who was thought to be very skillful in those rites, encouraged Eugenius with strong assurances of success and victory. Notwithstanding this, he was soon defeated; and after his death it cannot be doubted that Theodosius ordered all that had been done with respect to the altar of victory to be undone, though no particular mention is made of it by historians. It was thought extraordinary that Eugenius, who was a christian himself, should oblige heathens so much as he did in this respect, and Ambrose remonstrated against it. The whole of this account is extracted from Lardner, to whose authorities I refer my readers*.

Wt

* Testimonies Vol. iv. p. 372; &c.

We may now express our surprise, that a man of virtue and ability, as Symmachus was, should adhere to a religion in favour of which he had so little to allege. But at this time heathens of his character were very few, and they were infinitely out-numbered by men of superior virtue and ability who continually became christians. It is very possible that Symmachus, like Pliny the younger, Marcus Antoninus, and many other heathens, who were both men of letters, and men of business, might have given very little attention to the subject of christianity; and in this case their opinion ought not to have any weight at all. At this day we see men of the best understandings, either through inattention, or prejudice, maintain opinions which those who gave more attention to the subject, and are less prejudiced, are well satisfied have no reasonable foundation.

The minds of men are subject to a great variety of influences, which independently of any thing that can be called *evidence*, mislead them in judging concerning truth; and nothing more strongly biasses most men, and especially the virtuous and well-disposed, than respect for the opinions and practices of their parents and remote ancestors.

Considering the progress that christianity had made by its own evidence before the time of Constantine, it can be no wonder, that when it had the additional

additional aid of civil power, it should so soon complete its triumph over heathenism. It is to be regretted, however, that it should not have been suffered to complete this triumph, as no doubt it would have done by the same means by which it first made its way in the world. But Theodosius, in whose time the remains of the ancient religion must have been inconsiderable, and not at all formidable, was too impatient to clear his dominions of it.

It having been observed, that the heathens, from ancient custom, went to particular places for the observance of certain rites, Theodosius from the beginning of his reign forbade all access to such places, and many of the temples he entirely destroyed; so that the heathens, having no places of worship to go to, by degrees frequented those of the christians, especially when they found some amusement in their festivals.

It being observed, however, that many of the heathens, when they were deprived of their temples, sacrificed and performed their own rites within their own premises, Theodosius made a new law, by which this private exercise of the heathen religion was punished with confiscation of goods, and even with death.

When this law was carried into execution in Egypt, the people were exceedingly offended that
they

they were not permitted to sacrifice to the river, as their ancestors had been used to do, and were apprehensive that it would not rise as usual in consequence of it. It was even feared that there would be an insurrection on this account. But the emperor being informed of it, replied, that the flowing of the Nile, and the plenty depending upon it, were not to be preferred to our duty to God. "May the river," said he, "never flow again, if it cannot be procured without charms, sacrifices, and blood." However, the emperor persevered in his measures, and it was observed that the Nile was so far from not rising, that it rose so high that the people were afraid of an inundation ; and this was a means of bringing over many of the heathen Egyptians to christianity*.

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib: vii, Cap: 20, p: 309.

SECTION VI.

Of the Priscillianists, and Unitarians in this Period.

IN this reign there arose a new sect in the West, which is not so much as noticed by any of the Greek writers, I mean the *Priscillianists*, who held a mixture of Gnostic and Unitarian opinions. The origin of this sect, says Sulpitius Severus*, is from Egypt, from which country one Marcus a native of Memphis, brought it into Spain. His first converts were Agape, a woman of rank, and Helpidius a rhetorician; but the name was derived from their disciple *Priscillian*, a man of a noble family, very wealthy, learned, and eloquent. In other respects also this writer gives him a very high character, saying that he equally excelled in the qualifications of body and mind, that he was capable of bearing watching, hunger, and thirst, that he was not desirous of acquiring any thing, and very moderate in the use of what he did possess.

As

* Lib. ii. Cap. 46, p. 280.

As soon as Priscillian began to teach he made many converts, both among persons of rank, and those of the lower classes; and the women flocked to him in crowds, his modest appearance inspiring all persons with reverence. By this means his doctrine soon spread through all Spain, and was received by some bishops, among whom were Instantius and Salvianus. Adyginus the bishop of Corduba, in whose neighbourhood the new sect spread the most, engaged Idatius an old bishop to oppose them. But he being much too violent, the Priscillianists were increased, rather than diminished, in consequence of his interference.

After much controversy, a synod was held on the subject at Saragossa, at which the bishops from Aquitania in Gaul were present; and the Priscillianists not chusing to attend, they were condemned in their absence, and in this sentence were particularly involved Instantius and Salvianus, who were bishops, and Priscillian and Helpidius, who were laymen; and those who should receive them into communion were ordered to be excommunicated. In the mean time Instantius and Salvianus ordained Priscillian a bishop; but Idatius, and Ithacius, who had been appointed to acquaint other bishops with the decrees of the synod, being more urgent than ever to suppress this rising sect,
before

before it should have acquired more strength, very imprudently, says our author, applied to the secular judges to banish the heretics from their cities. In consequence of this a rescript was procured from the emperor Gratian, by which they were banished not only from the cities but from the empire, so that for that time they were totally dispersed.

But Instantius, Salvianus, and Priscillian went to Rome, to clear themselves of what was laid to their charge before Damasus the bishop of that city, and in their way they made many converts, especially among the more serious kind of the lower people. Damasus refusing to see them, and Ambrose of Milan being equally hostile to them, they applied to Macedonius, an officer near the emperor's person; and by his means procured an order to restore them to their churches; and on this Instantius and Priscillian returned to Spain. For Salvianus had died at Rome.

The enemies of Priscillian being disappointed in their farther applications to Gratian, turned their eyes towards Maximus; who had assumed the empire in Britain; and on his arrival at Triers, and hearing what was suggested against Priscillian and his friends, he appointed a synod to meet at Bordeaux. There Instantius was deposed, but Priscillian appealed to the emperor. When the
cause

cause came to be heard, Ithacius, who undertook the accusation of Priscillian, was so violent that he accused almost all persons of a studious turn of being favourers of Priscillian, without excepting even Martin the bishop of Trier, who had strongly objected to bringing this case before a civil tribunal, and at whose intercession Maximus had promised that no capital punishment should be inflicted in the case.* But on the application of other bishops, he referred the cause to Evodius the præfect, a violent man, who sentenced Priscillian to be put to death; and accordingly he was executed, together with several of his disciples, of whom also some were banished, and others had their goods confiscated.

These proceedings, however, were so far from putting a stop to the doctrine of Priscillian, that it was propagated farther than ever in consequence of them. For his followers, who had before respected him as a saint, now honoured him as martyr, and the bodies of those who had been put to death on this occasion were carried to Spain, and buried with the greatest solemnity. The followers of Priscillian, our author says, even swore by his

* St. Martin in France excommunicated a bishop for accusing certain heretics to Maximus the usurper of the empire, who put them to death. F. Pauls *Hist of the Inquisition* p. 8.

his name ; and the disturbances which arose from this business was not at all allayed. fifteen years afterwards, which was the time of his writing ; but he ascribes much of the confusion which then prevailed in the country to the ambition, and other vices, of the clergy.

That the Priscillianists held some Gnostic opinions cannot be doubted, because they are universally ascribed to them. They considered matter as the cause of all evil, they condemned marriage, and said that the souls of men were of a divine substance ; and having offended in heaven, were sent into bodies as a punishment of their sins. Like many of the early Gnostics, the Priscillianists were famous for their austerity and mortifications, and therefore were probably the same persons whom Philaster calls *Abstinentes*, in Gaul, Spain and Aquitain. With respect to the person of Christ, Austin says that they agreed with Sabellius ; and Pope Leo, who was their bitter enemy, says that they had drawn in the poison of Paul of Samosata and Photinus.

It was in a synod at Bracara (Braga) the metropolis of Gallicia in Spain, which was called for the purpose of condemning the Priscillianists, that the addition of *filioque* (and to the Son) which afterwards was the great bone of contention between the Eastern and Western churches, was first

first introduced into the Constantinopolitan creed. The bishops who were assembled on this occasion, in repeating the creed of this council, instead of contenting themselves with saying, according to it, that the Holy Spirit proceedeth *from the Father* said, who proceedeth *from the Father and the Son*; being led to it, it is supposed, by something which approached to it in an epistle which Pope Leo addressed to them.

The Visigoths, who were catholics, received this addition, and it was admitted in the council of Toledo. It also passed into Gaul, as we learn by the synod of Arles held under Charlemagne. The church of Rome did not receive the creed with this addition till a long time afterwards, by Nicholas the first according to some, and Sergius III. according to others. But Baronius says it was done by Benedict VII. who, at the request of the Emperor Henry, ordered the creed to be sung in the church of Rome, with this addition, after the gospel, as it had been usually sung in the West.

This addition to the creed was the principal cause of the schism between the Greek and the Latin churches; the former complaining, and seemingly with reason, that the Latins made this addition to the creed without the authority of a general council.

cil.* This is one remarkable instance of great effects arising from small causes; but all history, civil as well as ecclesiastical, abound with them. Trifling as this circumstance of the addition to the creed may be thought, it is of as much importance as any thing that was decided at the general councils of Ephesus, or Chalcedon.

That the Priscillianists were not, in all respects Gnostics or Manichæans is evident from their receiving, according to Austin, all the books of scripture, even the apocryphal ones, though he says they misinterpreted or perverted them†.

Of the Unitarians.

We hear very little of any Unitarians in this reign, there is however, an account of Bonosus a bishop in Macedonia, who was accused of the heresy of Photinus, and likewise of maintaining that Mary the mother of Jesus had commerce with her husband Joseph after his birth. Nysius of Thessalonica, and other neighbouring bishops, taking the affair into consideration, they condemned Bonosus, and forbade those who had been ordained by him to hold any communication with him. Mention is also made of Bonosians, who were Photinians,

* Sueur, A. D. 447.

† Hist. of Early Opinions, Vol. iv, p. 264.

tinians*, in a council at Arles, held in the time of pope Siricius, i. e. between A. D. 385 and A. D. 394.

SECTION VII.

Of the Arians and Novatians in this Reign.

IN this reign the Arians were much divided among themselves, the Eunomians as well as the other denominations of Arians. Eunomius himself, while he lived in Constantinople, performed divine service in the suburbs of that city, or in private houses within it. In this situation he wrote many books, and had many followers; so that in a short time his disciples in that place and neighbourhood were very numerous. On this account he was banished to Chalcedon, where, according to Philostorgius, he lived in a garden near the walls of the city. This however was not found to be sufficient; for Theodosius, having discovered that some persons in his court had adopted the

VOL. II.

C c c

opinions

* Binnii Concilia Tom. I. P. i. p. 564. Le Sueur.
A. D. 389.

opinions of Eunomius, not only banished them from his palace, but sent Eunomius himself from Chalcedon to Halmyris in Mæsia upon the Danube.

But this place being soon afterwards taken by the barbarians, he was banished to Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and as he had formerly written against Basil the bishop of that city, he was permitted to live on an estate of his own in Datoroeni, where Philostorgius says that himself, when he was twenty years of age, saw him. He describes him as a man of a most engaging person and address, as well as extraordinary genius. He was, I doubt not, a man of excellent character as well of great ability. This writer says that neither Actius nor Eunomius officiated as bishops, though they were considered as the heads of all the bishops of their persuasion. Eunomius, he says, never administered the Lord's supper after he left Cyzicum*.

Having mentioned these particulars concerning Eunomius, it may not be amiss to place here what Philostorgius says concerning the end of Actius. When he left Constantinople, he retired to Lesbos, where he lived on an estate which Julian gave him in the neighbourhood of Mitelene. Being accused to Procopius of taking the part of Valens, it
was

* Philostorgii Hist. Lib. ix. Cap. 4. p. 527. Lib. x. Cap. vi. p. 534.

was with difficulty that he escaped death during that usurpation. After this he lived with Eunomius and Florinus at Constantinople, and not long after died, Eunomius himself closing his eyes*.

Eunomius was succeeded by Theophronius, a Cappadocian, as Eunomius himself was. Being conversant in the philosophy of Aristotle, he maintained that as things changed from being *future*, to the *present*, and from that to the *past*, the divine being himself, as to his knowledge, must change also. But his hearers, being offended at this doctrine, expelled him from their church, and after this he had disciples who bore his own name.

Not long after Eutychius, another Eunomian, maintaining that since Christ had all things delivered to him from the Father, he must know even the day of judgment, and others of the sect not approving of this opinion, he left them, and went to Eunomius (who was said to approve of his sentiment) a short time before his death. But he who had in the mean time been made bishop of the Eunomians at Constantinople, not receiving Eutychius upon his return, he also formed a sect of his own. And some say it was not Eunomius himself, but either Theophronius, or this Eutychius, who changed the form of baptism, from being

* Philostorgii Hist. Lib. ix. Cap. 3. 6. p. 527, 528.

ing administered in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, into that of *the death of Christ*.

About the same time the Arians of Constantinople, who were not of the sect of Eunomius, disputed among themselves whether God could be called *a father* before the production of the Son, Marinus maintaining the affirmative, and Dorotheus from Antioch, the negative; and as Dorotheus kept possession of the ancient church, the followers of Marinus formed separate congregations. Selina the Arian bishop of the Goths, and the successor of Ulphilas, was of his party. After this many of the Arians, taking offence, joined the catholic church. But after the division had continued fifty years at Constantinople, the two parties united, having agreed that they never would have any more controversy on this subject*.

In this reign also, the Novatians were divided upon the subject of keeping Easter, some of them followed Sabbatius, who having been a Jewish convert adhered to the Jewish custom of celebrating this festival, on the fourteenth day of the month, and were called *Sabbatians*; the rest of the Novatians conformed to the custom of other christians in

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 17. p. 301. Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 23, 24. p. 300. &c.

in this respect, The followers of Sabbatius were chiefly from Phrygia and Galatia*.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Donatists in this Reign.

CONSIDERING how numerous the Donatists were, we cannot be much surprized to find them, like other numerous sects, divided among themselves, as they were in this reign.

On the death of Parmenian, their bishop of Carthage, they met at Bagaia to chuse a successor to him, when there were two competitors, Primianus, who is said to have been the more zealous Donatist, and Maximianus, a relation of the famous Donatus. The majority were for Primianus; but the friends of Maximianus, consisting of forty three bishops, were dissatisfied with the election, and formed separate congregations.

At another meeting, held at Cubursuffita a hundred bishops appeared on the side of Maximus; but

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 17. p. 304. Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 21. p. 289.

but still they were inferior in number to the partisans of Primianus; and at a third synod, held at Bagaia, three hundred bishops rescinded all that had been done in favour of Maximianus; and, as Austin says, they availed themselves of the imperial laws against such as divided their church. This, however, was probably in argument only, as the imperial officers would hardly allow those who were deemed sectaries themselves the benefit of laws enacted against sectaries.

The Maximianists themselves, though the smaller party, were afterwards divided into two others, viz. the Rogatians and the Claudianists. These divisions seem to have respected the heads of the party only, and not any matter of doctrine or discipline*.

* Long's History of the Donatists, p. 80.

S E C T I O N IX.

Of the Variety of Customs among Christians in this Period.

SOCRATES, on occasion of mentioning the preceding difference among the Novatians with respect to the time of celebrating Easter, proceeds to give an account of other varieties in the customs of christians, in this period, and in times preceding it, which is extremely curious, and abundantly justifies his inference that the unity of the church ought not to be broken for the sake of such differences. I shall therefore recite the principal of his observations.

“ The fast which precedes the festival of Easter
 “ is observed differently in different churches. At
 “ Rome they fast three whole weeks before Easter,
 “ excepting Saturday and Sunday : but in Illyri-
 “ cum, all Achaia, and Alexandria, they fast six
 “ weeks, and call it *Quadragesima*” (our Lent)
 “ others however begin the fast on the seventh
 “ week before Easter, and though they fast only
 “ three of these weeks, fasting only five days in
 “ each, they still call it *Quadragesima*, the reason
 “ of which I do not understand.

“ Nor

" Nor do christians differ only in the num-
 " ber of fasting days, but also in the manner of
 " fasting. For some abstain from all animal food,
 " others eat fish only, and some fowls as well as
 " fish, saying that, according to Moses, they also
 " were produced out of the water. Some abstain
 " from all fruits, and from eggs. Some live on
 " bread only, and others abstain even from that.
 " Some fast till the ninth hour, but after that eat
 " all kinds of food without distinction. Other
 " still different rules are observed in different
 " places, and innumerable reasons are produced
 " for them ; but since there is no scripture pre-
 " cept on the subject, it is plain that the apostles
 " left all persons at their intire liberty in these
 " respects."

" There is no less difference in the customs
 " relating to public worship. For whereas all o-
 " ther churches receive the communion on Satur-
 " day, those of Alexandria and Rome, following
 " some ancient tradition, refuse to do it. But the
 " Egyptians in the neighbourhood of Alexandria,
 " and also those of Thebais, have indeed assem-
 " blies for public worship on Saturday, but do
 " not received the communion as other christians
 " do, for after having feasted on all kinds of food,
 " they receive the communion in the evening.
 " Moreover, at Alexandria, the scriptures are read
 " and

“ and explained on the Wednesday and Friday,
 “ and every thing is done as in time of public
 “ worship, except the celebration of the eucharist.
 “ And this is a very ancient custom of the church
 “ of Alexandria ; for it appears that Origen gave
 “ lectures on those days.”

“ In Alexandria also the readers and the sing-
 “ ers are taken without distinction from among the
 “ catechumens, or the complete christians, where-
 “ as all other churches admit no catechumens to
 “ that rank.”

“ I have observed also another peculiar cus-
 “ tom in Thessaly. If any of the clergy there
 “ sleep with his wife to whom he was lawfully
 “ married before his preferment, he is deposed ;
 “ whereas in the East all the clergy, and even the
 “ bishops, are left at their full liberty in this res-
 “ pect ; for many of them have children while they
 “ are bishops. The person who introduced this cus-
 “ tom into Thessaly was Heliodorus bishop of
 “ Trica in that country, the same who, when he
 “ was a young man wrote the *Æthiopics*. The
 “ same custom also passed to Thessalonica, Mace-
 “ donia and Achaia.”

“ In Thessaly they baptize only at Easter, so that
 “ there many die without baptism. At Antioch in
 “ Syria the situation of the churches is the reverse
 “ of what it is in other places, for the altar is not

“ placed at the East, but at the West end of
 “ them.”

“ In Achaia, Thessaly, and Jerusalem, prayers
 “ are made when the candles are lighted, according
 “ to the practice of the Novatians at Constantino-
 “ ple. At Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and at Cy-
 “ prus, the bishops and presbyters always interpret
 “ the scriptures in the evening of Saturday and
 “ Sunday after the candles are lighted. The No-
 “ vatians in the neighbourhood of the Hellespont
 “ do not pray in the same manner as those at
 “ Constantinople. In most of their churches,
 “ however, they conform to the custom of the ca-
 “ tholic church. Upon the whole, you will hard-
 “ ly find two churches in all the sects which exact-
 “ ly agree with respect to their prayers.”

“ At Alexandria no presbyter preaches, a cus-
 “ tom which was introduced there after Arius had
 “ made so great a disturbance in that church. At
 “ Rome they fast every Saturday. At Cæsarea in
 “ Cappadocia they excommunicate all who sin af-
 “ ter baptism, just as the Novatians do. The same
 “ is done by the Macedonians on the Hellespont,
 “ and the Quartodecimans in Asia. The Nova-
 “ tians in Phrygia do not admit to their communi-
 “ on those who have married two wives. Those
 “ of Constantinople neither openly receive nor o-
 “ penly reject them, but in the West they openly
 “ receive

“ receive them. These differences, in my opinion,
 “ on, arose from the bishops in different churches,
 “ whose peculiar customs have been transmitted
 “ as a law to posterity*.”

Sozomen mentions several of these varieties in the customs of different churches, and likewise on other peculiarities with respect to discipline at this period, among which are the following.

“ In the province of Scythia, though there are
 “ many cities, there is but one bishop ; whereas in
 “ other provinces even villages have regularly consecrated bishops, as in Arabia, Cyprus, and among the Novatians and Montanists in Phrygia.
 “ At Rome there are no more than seven deacons, after the example of those who were appointed by the Apostles ; but in other churches the number of deacons is not limited. At Rome they sing the Hallelujah only once a year, on Easter Sunday ; so that many of the Romans make use of it as a kind of oath, saying *may they live to hear, or sing that hymn.*

“ In the church of Alexandria there is this peculiarity, that the bishop does not stand up while the gospels are read, a thing which I never saw or heard of in any other place. There also the archdeacon only reads that sacred book, in other churches the deacons. In many church-

ca

* Lib. v. Cap. 22. p. 294.

“ches the presbyters only read, in others, on the
 “principal festivals the bishops themselves read,
 “as on Easter Sunday at Constantinople.”

“The same custom is not observed in all pla-
 “ces with respect to prayers, psalms, and the
 “books that are read in the time of public wor-
 “ship. *The revelation of Peter*, which is rejected
 “as a spurious book by the antients, is read once
 “every year in some churches in Palestine on
 “Good Friday, which is a religious fast in com-
 “memoration of our Lord’s sufferings. The book
 “that is called the *revelation of t e Apostle Paul*,
 “which was unknown to the antients, is greatly
 “commended by many of the monks. Some say
 “that this book was first found in the reign of The-
 “odosius. For they say that in the house of Paul
 “at Tarsus, there was a marble chest in a subterra-
 “neous place, in which this book was deposited,
 “and, that it was discovered by a particular reve-
 “lation. But when I made inquiry concerning
 “it, I was informed by an old presbyter of the
 “church of Tarsus that he had never heard of any
 “such thing, and that he suspected it to be a fic-
 “tion of the heretics*.”

I mention this last circumstance as a specimen
 of the manner in which relics, and other remains of
 antiquity, were commonly said to be discovered
 in

in this age, that the reader may judge how little credit is due to them.

Happy would it have been for the christian church, if particular *opinions* had been allowed to be held, with as little censure as these peculiar *practices*, and if nothing but good morals had been deemed essential to christian communion. But instead of improving in liberality, the terms of church communion were continually made stricter than before, till at length no variation even in rites and ceremonies would be allowed. Much ground must be measured back again before we recover the simplicity of the apostolic age.

S E C T I O N X.

Of a Change in the Discipline of the Eastern Churches in this Reign.

A Considerable change was made in the interior discipline of the church of Constantinople, and afterwards in the Eastern churches in general, in this reign, by discontinuing the office of *penitentiary presbyter*, whose business it had been

been to direct every thing that related to confession and penance. Before this time there had been such an officer in every church, and, to appearance, the custom was an useful one. For, as Sozomen observes, since no person who had been excommunicated could be received into the church without confessing the sins for which he had been excluded, it appeared too hard to oblige every person to make such a confession before the whole choir of presbyters, and therefore choice had been made of one of the most discreet of them to hear such confessions. This regulation had been made among all the sects of christians except the Novatians, who received none into their communion after they had been once excommunicated. Also this office of penitentiary presbyter was still kept up in all the sects of christians except the catholics of the East, by whom it was discontinued, on the following occasion.

In the time of Nestarius, a woman of good condition, having been excommunicated for some offence or other, applied as usual to the penitentiary presbyter, and he had recommended to her fasting, and frequent prayer; and for this the church, as among the catholics at this day, appears to have been considered as the most proper place. After some time she confessed that, besides the fault for which she had been enjoined this penance,

penance, a deacon had criminal conversation with her while she was performing her penance in the church itself. Upon this the deacon was excommunicated, and the people were so much disturbed at the scandal which this affair brought upon the whole society, that the bishop thought proper to abolish the office of penitentiary presbyter, and left all persons who had been excommunicated to come to communion as they should judge themselves to be fit for it ; and this example was followed by almost all other churches, except that of Rome.

This account, Socrates says he had from Eudemon, the person who gave this advice to Nestarius ; but he expresses much doubt whether the alteration had been favourable to the discipline of the church. Sozomen says that offences were much increased afterwards, and that for this reason he approved of the law of Theodosius, which excluded all women from any office in the church, unless they had children, and were sixty years old, which ordered that woman whose hair was shorn should be refused admittance into the churches, and that the bishops who suffered them to enter should be deposed.

The custom had been for the penitents to stand in a place by themselves, with all the marks of sorrow and contrition, often with their faces
to

to the ground. Out of compassion to their situation, the bishops, and others sometimes joined with them in this mode of prostration, the bishop got up, the penitents rose also. He then dismissed them with a prayer, and when they had performed the penance which he enjoined they were received into communion*.

S E C T I O N XI.

Of the Ornaments of Churches, and of Festivals, and the increase of Superstition in this Period.

WE see in the works of Gregory bishop of Nyssa, a writer of this age, that it was the custom to ornament their churches in the East with pictures, and even statues, representing the acts of the martyrs, and other things which it was thought would make a good impression on the spectators. In his oration on Theodore the martyr, he says, “ When we come into a place like this, in which
“ we are now assembled, in which are the memorials and sacred relics of the saints, we are first de-
“ lighted

* Socratis Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 19. p. 287. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 16. p. 299.

" lighted with the magnificence and ornaments of
 " the temple of God ; where the artist has formed
 " wood into the figures of animals, and has given
 " to stone the polish of silver ; where the painter
 " has described to the life the heroic acts of the
 " martyrs, and the frightful form of the tyrants,
 " the fiery furnace, and the glorious triumph of
 " the wrestlers, the figure of Christ in an human
 " form presiding over the contest ; describing eve-
 " ry thing as in a book, understood by all. For
 " the silent picture upon the wall may be said to
 " speak, and instruct. Histories are also drawn
 " upon the pavement of the floor, that we tread up-
 " on, &c.*"

It is probable that this mode of ornamenting
 churches began as early as the reign of Constan-
 tine ; and had it proceeded no farther, the practice
 would not have been liable to any censure. There
 was no religious worship then paid to these ima-
 ges, they exercised the ingenuity of the artist, they
 gave pleasure to persons of taste, and they instruct-
 ed those who could not read. It was also an in-
 nocent method of drawing the heathens from their
 temples, which were ornamented in a similar man-
 ner, to the christian churches.

But, alas ! with the same good intentions, some
 of the zealous christians of this age took some un-

VOL. II.

E e e

war

* Opera Vol. ii. p. 1011.

warrantable steps, such at least as soon drew after them consequences highly unfavourable to genuine christianity. With a view to draw men off from the rites of the heathen religion, they provided many of the same indulgences for them under the name of christianity. Thus, though they pretended to suppress the heathen festivals, they allowed the same amusements and gratifications, such as feasting, and every expression of joy not properly vicious, at the same time, and in the same places; but telling the people it was not now done as formerly, in honour of some heathen God, but of a christian saint. This practice is avowed by this Gregory of Nissa, and is by him ascribed to Gregory of Neocæsarea, in a much earlier period. Whoever formed this idea, and however innocent it might be in the first conception of it (which I am very far from being disposed to deny) it had very unhappy consequences. For this imitation of paganism brought in at length a system of worship which differed but little from the former, and defeated much of the good moral tendency of christianity.

There was a very great increase of the profession of christianity in this reign, much of which, I doubt not, was the effect of conviction; but two much of it is to be ascribed to this kind of artifice, and a good deal to open force.

Supersti-

Superstition of various kinds kept increasing in this as in the preceding reign, and especially that of conveying dead bodies and relics of saints from place to place. This grew to so great an height, that in A. D. 886, Theodosius made a law to forbid the removal of any body that had once been buried, to make any distinction between one martyr and another, or to make a traffic of their relics. People were allowed, however, to shew what marks of respect they pleased to their saints at the places where they had been buried, and to erect what buildings they thought proper upon them. But the demand for relics was so great that no law could restrain the traffic in them. It was commonly pretended that the place where the bones, &c. of any ancient martyr were hid was discovered by a vision, and the general credulity in this case made very slight degrees of evidence suffice*.

The prayers of Ambrose for Theodosius after his death, shews what was the current opinion concerning the state of the dead in this period. He speaks of him as in the company of the saints, and particularly as embracing Gratian, whose death he had revenged, which as Sueur observes, is by no means a state of purgatory. He then prays that God would give him that rest which he had

* Sueur, A. D. 886.

had prepared for his saints, and that his soul might return from the place whither it was descended, where it could not feel the stings of death. In his idea, therefore, the souls of good men were in *hades* a place under ground, and not in *heaven* with God and Christ. "I have loved him," says he, "and
 " will not leave him till I have conducted him to
 " the place where his merits call him, where life is
 " perpetual, where there is no contagion of corrup-
 " tion, no groaning, or crying, where this mortal
 " shall be cloathed with immortality, and this cor-
 " ruptible shall put on incorruption." This looks as if Ambrose hoped that by his prayers he might remove Theodosius from his place in *hades*, into *heaven*, where the martyrs were at that time generally supposed to be*. Tertullian is the first who speaks of prayers for the dead†.

In

* Dilexi, et ideo prosequor eum usque ad regionem vivorum, nec deferam, donec fletis et precibus inducam virum quo sua merita vocant, in montem domini sanctum, ubi perennis vita, ubi corruptelæ nulla contagio, nullus gemitus, nullus dolor, nulla consortia mortuorum, vera regio viventium, ubi mortale hoc induat immortalitatem, et corruptibile hoc induat incorruptionem.† Oratio funebris pro Theodosio, Ambrosii, Opera Vol. v. p. 122.

† De Corona, Cap. iii. Opera p. 102.

In this place I shall just mention a few circumstances noticed by Bingham, as having their origin about this time.

In the time of Chrysostom persons began to attend the communion without receiving it. Bingham 769. In the age after this it was ordered by the council of Agde, that the people should not depart before the solemnity of the mass. Bingham 776.

Leo the great declaimed against those who received the bread and not the wine, at the eucharist. Bingham 786.

According to Synesius, no person was to receive an excommunicated person into his house, or to eat at the same table with him. Persons were forbidden to converse familiarly with them while living, or to perform their funeral obsequies when they were dead. Bingham ii, 36.

In the fourth century the canonical singers were made an order of *clergy*, were ordained with certain rites and ceremonies, and charged, in this ordination, *to believe with their hearts what they sung with their mouths, and to approve by their works what they believed with their heart.* Williams p. 84.

P E R I O D

THE HISTORY OF THE PER. XII.

PERIOD XII.

FROM THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS. A. D. 395.
TO THAT OF HONORIUS, A. D. 424.

SECTION I.

*From the Accession of Arcadius, A. D. 395, to the
Deposition of Chrysostom, A. D. 408.*

AFTER the death of Theodosius, his son Arcadius, on whom devolved the government of the East, returned to Constantinople, and Rufinus the prefect of the prætorian guards being put to death on suspicion of treason, Eutropius the eunuch succeeded to his power, which as the prince was weak, was in a manner unbounded ; but abusing his authority, he also was afterwards put to death.

Sozomen gives the following account of the state of religion at the beginning of this reign. The two emperors confirmed all that their father had
done

done in favour of the Confubstantialists, and added much of themselves to the encouragement which he had given them*; and the subjects imitating their princes, many of the heathens came over to the christian religion, and heretics to the catholic church. The number of Arians and Eunomians continually diminished, chiefly on account of their differences among themselves; but the Novatians retained their privileges, and derived much credit from the ability, the learning, and the exemplary conduct of their bishops, particularly Sisinnius of Constantinople; who is spoken of as a person highly accomplished, both as a scholar, and a man of the world.†

Nectarius bishop of Constantinople dying about this time, the great reputation of John, a presbyter of Antioch (who afterwards for his eloquence obtained the name of *Chrysostom*, and whose history will make a great part of that of this reign) induced both the prince and the people to make choice of him for his successor; though Theophilus bishop

* Honorius excused the inferior clergy from the tax on trade and commerce, in which they were allowed to be concerned, on account of the funds of the church not being sufficient for their support together with that of the inferior clergy. Bingham p. 179.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 1. p. 323. Socrates Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 22. p. 340.

shop of Alexandria envied him that elevation, and wished to have a presbyter of his own church raised to that dignity.

Chrysostom was a native of Antioch, originally designed for the bar ; but being disgusted with that profession, he applied himself to sacred literature, and persuaded two of his friends, Theodorus and Maximus who had attended the lectures of Libanius along with him, to do the same. Afterwards, this Theodorus was made bishop of Mopsuestia, and became famous as the master of Nestorius. Maximus was bishop of Seleucia in Isauria. But before their elevation to these bishoprics they had led a monastic life under Diodorus and Carterius, of whom the former was afterwards advanced to the bishopric of Tarsus, and wrote many books, in which he explained the scriptures in their obvious and literal sense. He is also said to have held that opinion which was afterwards called Nestorianism, and to have taught it to Theodorus, as the latter did to Nestorius himself.

While Chrysostom was at Antioch, he wrote several of his books, as well as acquired great reputation by his eloquent preaching. He was a man of great simplicity of character, severity of manners, and freedom of speech, which brought him many enemies*. His whole history shews that

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 1, 2, 3. p. 308, &c.

that, notwithstanding his great virtues, he was very haughty and arbitrary.

This temper, and these manners, which led him to be very strict with his clergy, and to depose many of them, soon created him enemies in his own church; and he also made himself enemies at court, both by his uncompliant temper, and his invectives against Eutropius, who was over the bed chamber, and Gainas the Goth, who was master of the horse. The former had offended him by petitioning for a law to take offenders from the churches in which they took sanctuary, and the latter by proposing that the Arians, of whom he was one, might have the use of one of the churches within the city. He also gave offence to other courtiers. But his greatest enemy, after some time, was the empress Eudoxia, and with respect to her Chrysostom certainly behaved very improperly*.

Chrysostom's most faithful adherents were the people, with whom his eloquence made him amazingly popular. Indeed, people of all ranks crowded to hear him; and by this means many of the pagans became converts to christianity, and many sectaries were brought over to the catholic church. It would have been well if this eloquent preacher had confined himself to this mode of making con-

verts; but he made no scruple of having recourse to others, which less became a christian bishop. In a very harsh manner he threatened Sisinius the Novatian bishop of Constantinople, that he would take his church from him. But being a man of the most pleasing manners, and a great favourite at court, as on every account he deserved to be, and as the Novatians were protected by the laws, it was not in the power of this imperious bishop to carry his threats into execution*. The Arians were more in his power, though we have no account of any particular violence that he was guilty of with respect to them.

Chrysostom did not confine his attention to the city of which he was bishop, but also took strict cognizance of every thing within his diocese, as a metropolitan, and there being much corruption and many abuses in the churches, he expelled from their sees no less than thirteen bishops in the neighbourhood of Ephesus only, and also the bishop of Nicomedia, and put others in their places. He was, however, blamed by many for his behaviour on this occasion, as he deprived many of the Novatians, with whom he had no business, and also the Quartodecimans, of their churches; and for making Heraclides, one of his own presbyters, bishop of Ephesus,

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 22. p. 341.

sus, he being generally thought to be unworthy of that honour. By doing what he thought to be his duty in these cases, but in a more arbitrary manner, and with more severity, than became him, he made himself still more enemies; and they now began openly to accuse him of exceeding the bounds of his authority*.

He was particularly accused of cruelty in inveighing against Eutropius, as he lay under the communion table of the church, in which he had taken refuge, when he was out of favour at court, and thought his life in danger; the bishop having taken this opportunity of making an harangue to the people, in which he declaimed against the insolence of the great, and the instability of all human power†. He particularly drew upon himself the ill offices of Serapion his archdeacon, who was a proud and quarrelsome man; of Olympias a rich young widow, who had been made deaconess, but whom he reproved for making an improper distribution of her wealth, and of the monks in general, many of whom he reproached for leaving their monasteries, and coming abroad into the world unnecessarily. All these joined in taking every opportunity of censuring him, and among other things

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 19. p. 338. Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 6. p. 333.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 8. p. 336.

things for never going to any entertainment, but always eating by himself, which they attributed to pride, but his friends to the particular attention that he was obliged to give to his diet, in consequence of his weak constitution, and the intensity of his studies*.

Chrysoftom had also a quarrel with Severianus bishop of Gabala in Syria, of whom he himself had been very fond, and to whom he had committed the care of his church when he went on his progress through Asia, and also with Antiochus bishop of Ptolemais, who on some occasion had come to Constantinople. But both these men had acquired great reputation as preachers, so as in some measure to rival Chrysoftom in what he most excelled, and no doubt prided himself in. Serapion contributed much to inflame this quarrel with Severianus. The latter being much admired by the emperor and empress, this quarrel gave them much disturbance, and the empress herself condescended to interpose between them ; and at length by her earnest intreaties, in which she placed her young child Theodosius on the knees of Chrysoftom in the church of the apostles, she in some measure succeeded †

Chrysoftom

* Sozomeni Cap. ix. p. 337.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 10. p. 338. Socrati Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 10, p. 325.

Chrysoſtom was not a little hurt in conſequence of a controverſy between his adverſary Theophilus biſhop of Alexandria and the monks of Egypt ; of which, for this and other reaſons, being one of the moſt important circumſtances in the eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of this period, it will be neceſſary to give an account.

The more ignorant of theſe monks, who were a great majority of them, maintained that God was corporeal, and had the form of man ; hearing with real ears, and ſeeing with real eyes, as he is represented in the popular language of the ſcriptures. Theophilus the biſhop of Alexandria, in a paſchal letter (which it appears to have been the cuſtom of the biſhops of that city to write annually) condemned this opinion. But the monks thereupon coming in crouds to the city, and threatening his life, he diſſembled with them, and made them believe that he was of their opinion ; and when they required him to condemn the books of Origen, which they ſaid were unfavourable to it, he aſſured them that he was as much diſpleaſed with the opinions of Origen as they were*.

This buſineſs might have ended here, had it not been for the animofity which Theophilus had conceived againſt four brothers, whoſe names were Ammonius, Dioſcorus, Eufebius, and Euthymius (who

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 11, p. 340.

(who for their size were commonly called *the tall*) to whom he had been much attached, and whom he thought ungrateful. One of these, viz. Dioscorus, he had made a bishop, but the other three, notwithstanding his earnest remonstrances, would leave him, and follow the monastic life, as they had done before he invited them to Alexandria. In order to do these men an injury, it is said that Theophilus accused them to their friends of being favourers of the opinions of Origen, and believing God to be incorporeal. This excited almost a civil war among the monks, who had little to do but to dispute; and by them were first introduced the two appellations of *Origenists* on the one hand, and *Anthropomorphites* on the other, both being used as terms of reproach*.

At length Dioscorus, Ammonius, and about eighty more of the monks having seen through the malice of Theophilus, left Egypt, and went first to Jerusalem, and thence to Scythopolis; thinking that place a convenient retreat, as it abounded with palm trees, the leaves of which the monks made use of in their manufactories. But Theophilus having sent to Constantinople to do them all the ill offices in his power, Ammonius and his friends went thither also, accompanied by Isidorus from

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii, Cap. 12: p. 341. Socratis Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 7. p. 319.

SECT. I. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 432

from the church of Alexandria, to complain of Theophilus. Chrysostom received these monks very kindly, and though he did not admit them to communion, yet as he had heard no accusation against them, he permitted them to pray in his church. He also wrote to Theophilus in their favour, desiring him either to restore them to his communion, as persons who thought justly concerning God, or else to send some person properly authorized to accuse them. But to this Theophilus made no reply.

Some time after this Ammonius and his friends complained to the empress of the ill usage of Theophilus, and she received them very graciously, promising that a synod should soon be called, and that justice should be done them. This being reported at Alexandria, with the addition, which was not true, that Chrysostom had received the monks into his communion, Theophilus was more than ever inflamed against him; and from this time it is said that he formed a plan to eject him from his see*.

Carefully concealing his designs, Theophilus for the present only wrote to the distant metropolitans, requesting that they would join him in censuring the works of Origen. Epiphanius the metropolitan bishop of Cyprus entered into his measures,

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 12. p. 342.

measures, and having called a synod of the bishops of that island passed a regular censure upon Origen, but upon what account is not said. It is not, however, at all probable that he, or any of the bishops of this age, would take part with the monks of Egypt, and condemn the works of this great man because he supposed God to be incorporeal.

When Theophilus heard what had been done in Cyprus, he also called a synod of his bishops, and did the same in Egypt. But Chrysostom paid no attention to what they had done, which gave great offence to these two metropolitans; and his own clergy, perceiving that something was in agitation against their bishops, with whom they were on very bad terms, did every thing in their power towards calling a council on the subject, which accordingly seems to have been summoned; and on this business Epiphanius went to Constantinople, and Theophilus, having sent the bishops of his diocese before him, followed leisurely himself^a.

Epiphanius, while he was at Constantinople on this business, declined having any communication with Chrysostom; and conferring privately with the other bishops, urged upon them the necessity of condemning the works of Origen, and excommunicating Diolcorus and his companions. But partly through the remonstrances of the other bishops

^a Socratis Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 9, 10 p. 323, 324.

bishops in favour of Origen, and partly through the civilities of Dioscorus and his friends to himself, he became sensible of the impropriety of his conduct, and left the city ; but he died before he reached Cyprus*.

At this critical time Chrysostom unfortunately drew upon himself the indignation of the empress by an invective against women, in which he was thought to allude to the empress herself ; having been offended at her, on the idea, whether just or not, that she had taken part with Epiphanius and others against him, and that when her son was sick, she had employed Epiphanius to pray for him. In this state of things the bishops assembled at Chalcedon, where Cyrinus, a friend of Theophilus was bishop ; and there the enemies of Chrysostom being the majority, and he not chusing to obey their summons, but appealing to a more general council, a sentence of deposition was pronounced against him. At the same time Theophilus behaved kindly to the monks, and receiving them into his communion, they made no complaints against him, nor was any thing said about the works of Origen. This was the more easily managed, as Dioscorus had died just before,

VOL. II.

G g g

and

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii, Cap. 14, 15. p. 444. Sozomenus Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 14. p. 329.

and Ammonius was sick at the time of holding this council*.

S E C T I O N II.

From the Deposition of Chrysostom A. D. 403, to his Death, A. D. 407; and that of Arcadius, A. D. 408.

THE people of Constantinople, hearing of what had passed at Chalcedon, were so tumultuous, that it was with great difficulty that Chrysostom could obey the order of the council, so as to withdraw from the city privately. After this the people assembling from all places, and crowding to the palace, the emperor could not resist their importunity to have their bishop recalled. Accordingly an order was issued for the purpose, and notwithstanding all the remonstrances of Chrysostom, that he ought not to return to his see till those who had deposed should be brought to reinstate him, he was obliged to resume the episcopal functions. At the same time the sailors, and other

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 17, p. 347. Socratis Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 15, p. 331.

SEC. II. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 435

other persons from Egypt taking part with their bishop, and the people of Constantinople with theirs, both sides had recourse to arms ; and many were wounded, and some killed, in consequence of which Theophilus left the city, and returned to Egypt. After this a synod of about sixty bishops assembled at Constantinople, and rescinded all that had been done against Chrysostom at Chalcedon.*

Chrysostom, confiding perhaps in his popularity, and irritated against the empress, gave way to the natural vehemence of his temper on occasion of a statue of her being erected on the south side of a church, just before the senate house, and the pompous ceremonies with which it was placed there ; all which he said was done in contempt of the church, and accordingly he exclaimed against it in his sermons. This the empress took so ill, that she endeavoured to call another synod. But the bishop was so far from being intimidated, that he reproached her for her conduct more openly than ever, calling her another Herodias, who wished to have the head of another John, meaning his own, in a charger. Such language as this can never be justified ; and it is no wonder that the empress was now bent upon his ejection, and that the emperor

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 18, 19. p. 348, 350.

Socratis Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 16, 17. p. 332, 334.

emperor, who was wholly governed by her, was drawn into her measures.

Accordingly, on the Christmas day following, the emperor declined going to church as usual, and sent to inform the bishop, that he should not communicate with him till he had given satisfaction with respect to the charges advanced against him ; and he replying that he was ready to answer any thing that could be laid to his charge, a synod of the neighbouring bishops was assembled, and in this he was condemned for having resumed the episcopal functions without proper authority. When he pleaded that the proceedings of the council of Chalcedon had been reversed by another which was subsequent to it, it was replied that the latter was not so numerous as the former, and therefore could not, according to the canons, reverse its decrees. This law had been made by the Arians when they deposed Athanasius, and were apprehensive of a change in the future temper of the times ; and of this the catholics, who had no better precedent to serve their purpose, thought proper to avail themselves*. Who does not see the decisive influence of the will of the governing powers in these three councils ?

After

* Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii. Cap. 20. p. 351. Socrati Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 18. p. 335.

After this sentence Chrysoſtom deſiſted from diſcharging any of the epiſcopal functions, and confined himſelf to the epiſcopal houſe. But his adherents, whenever they had opportunity, to ſhew their attachment to him, formed ſeparate congregations, and were called *Joannites*. As it was evident that the people would never be quiet till the biſhop was removed, the emperor baniſhed him to Culcuſum in Armenia; but though much contrivance was uſed in conveying him out of the city, a tumult could not be prevented, and in it the church and ſenate houſe mentioned above were burned down*.

The friends of Chryſoſtom ſtill reſuſing to communicate with his enemies, though Arſacius a very worthy man was appointed to ſucceed him, the emperor ſent ſoldiers to diſperſe them wherever they were aſſembled; and, as is almoſt unavoidable when ſoldiers are employed, many perſons were plundered of what they had of moſt value, and many quitted the city, eſpecially one Nicaſete, a native of Nicomedia, of whom Sozomen gives the higheſt character.

When all was quiet within the city, the præfeſt began to make inquiry who were the authors of the fire; and being an heathen he ſeemed to rejoice in the calamity, and inflicted heavy puniſhments

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii, Cap. 21, 22. p. 352.

ments on many persons*. On this occasion many of the friends of Chrysoſtom forming ſeparate congregations, a law was made to prevent any of the catholics making any ſuch ſchiſms for the future on the penalty of excommunication†.

Innocent, biſhop of Rome, being informed of theſe proceedings againſt Chryſoſtom by Caſſian, and others of his friends who had been ſent from the Eaſt for the purpoſe, was much diſpleaſed at them, and wrote a letter of conſolation to him, and another to the people of his ſee, cenſuring their conduct and obſerving|that an Arian ſynod, by the rules of which they had been guided, ought not to have ſerved as a precedent for the catholics ; and that it was neceſſary to call a more general council to reſtore the peace of the church. But the pains which he took for this purpoſe were defeated by the enemies of Chryſoſtom at Conſtantinople‡.

The death of the empreſs and ſome peculiar circumſtances in that of Cyrinus the biſhop of Chalcedon, Chryſoſtom's inveterate enemy, and alſo a great hail which fell at Conſtantinople preſently after his baniſhment, were interpreted by his

* Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 23. p. 354. Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vi, Cap. 18. p. 335.

† Sozomeni Hiſt. Lib. viii. Cap. 24. p. 356.

‡ Ibid. Hiſt, Lib. viii. Cap. 26. p. 359.

his friends as marks of the divine displeasure at the conduct of his enemies*. In the mean time, he, having much wealth at his command, from the liberality of his friends, and especially of Olympias the deaconess, employed it in acts of generosity, especially in redeeming from the Isaurians many persons whom they had carried away as slaves, in their incursions to plunder the country ; and in consequence of this conduct, he lived in great reputation among the Armenians ; and many persons flocked to him from Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia†. This being a great mortification to his enemies, they procured an order for his removal to Pityuns ; but he died on the journey at Comanis in Armenia, owing, it is said to the hardships to which he was exposed‡.

In the reign of Theodosius II. ample justice was done to the memory of Chrysostom, his relics being then carried with great pomp, and an amazing concourse of people, to Constantinople, on which occasion the Propontis was covered with vessels ; and these being all furnished with torches, they made a most magnificent spectacle. When the relics were deposited in the church,
the

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 19, p. 338.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. viii, Cap. 27, p. 362.

‡ Ibid. Hist. Lib. viii, Cap. 28. p. 363.

the emperor himself looking towards the coffin, solemnly asked pardon in the name of his ancestors for the injuries which they had done him*.

Arcadius himself did not long survive Chrysostom, but died A. D. 408. universally beloved for his piety and gentle disposition, without any reflection but that of having been governed too much by his favourites and his wife. He left a son of the name of Theodosius just weaned, and three daughters, of whom the eldest, Pulcheria, was remarkable for her virtue and piety, and the care which she took of the education of her brother, in whose name Anthemius, the præfect of the prætorian guards, administered the affairs of the government.

* Theod. Hist. Lib. v. Cap. 36, p. 236.

SECTION III.

Of the Disturbances in Egypt.

SINCE the empire became christian the Jews had not suffered much, the catholic emperors having had no other objects of their hostilities besides the heathens and the heretics. But they sometimes brought themselves into difficulties, and suffered in consequence of their turbulent disposition, and their inveteracy towards the christians. In this reign they were expelled from Alexandria for their cruel and licentious proceedings on the following occasion.

The people of this city were always disposed to factions, and the Jews who resided there in great numbers ever since the time of Alexander the Great, were as ready as any other of the inhabitants to enter into them; and, at this time, the people were much divided about a set of players, who exhibited on a Saturday, when the Jews, having nothing else to do, attended. They seeing one Hierax, a schoolmaster, and a great admirer of Cyril, (the bishop who had succeeded Theophilus) being always ready to begin to clap whenever he

preached, enter the theatre, cried out that he came thither for no other purpose than to raise a disturbance ; and the Jews being favoured by Orestes the evil governor, who was jealous of the power of the bishop on account of his frequently controuling him in his measures, Hierax was seized, and on some pretence, which is not mentioned, he was exposed to torture on the public theatre.

This proceeding greatly exasperated Cyril, who sent for the chief of the Jews, and threatened them with his vengeance if they did not desist from their ill offices to the christians. But they, thinking they had the favour of the governor, were not disposed to conciliation. On the contrary, a number of the lower sort of them, having agreed upon a signal by which to distinguish one another, drew together a great concourse of people in the night, by a cry which they raised, that the principal church in the city was on fire, and in the confusion which this occasioned they killed many christians.

The authors of these murders being known, Cyril, without consulting the Governor, went the next day with a great multitude, and both seized upon the synagogue, and expelled all the Jews from the city. The præfect, displeased at this irregular and violent proceeding, and concerned to see such a number of people leave the city, complained to the emperor, to whom Cyril also wrote,
to

to explain the reasons of his conduct. The bishop and the præfect being now declared and irreconcilable enemies, the monks of Nitria, taking the part of the bishop, came to the number of four or five hundred, and attacking the præfect, wounded him dangerously on the head with a stone and dispersed his attendants. But the people of the city, coming to his assistance, drove away the monks, and seizing on one of them, viz. Ammonius, who has been mentioned before, they exposed him to so great torture that he died under it. This man Cyril buried in a church with great parade, as if he had been a martyr, though the historian says that sensible and moderate persons saw his death in a very different light, as he did not suffer for his profession of christianity, but in consequence of engaging in civil faction.

The party of Cyril incurred still more blame by the shocking violence of which they were guilty with respect to the celebrated Hypatia, who, though a woman, taught philosophy in the public Platonic school at Alexandria. Because she was often observed to be in conversation with Orestes during this disturbance, it was imagined that she was in the party against the bishop; and in consequence of this a number of his friends, with Peter, a reader in the church, at their head, seized upon her as she was going home in a chair,

chair, and dragging her into a church, they first stripped her naked, and then killed her with tiles; and having torn her limb from limb, they burned the parts in a public place in the city. This horrid outrage unworthy even of brutes, justly brought a great degree of odium on Cyril, and the christians in general. This happened in Lent, in the sixth year of Theodosius, A. D. 414.

In this last act of violence the Jews are not mentioned as having taken any part. If they had, it would have been that of Hypatia, but at that time they were probably out of the city. But several of them suffered by the order of the emperor on another occasion. At a place called Immestar, between Antioch and Chalcis, the Jews were entertaining themselves with deriding the christians, and Christ also. To do this more effectually, they tied a christian boy to a cross, at first only in ridicule, but at length they began to beat him, and whether they intended it or not, he died of the ill usage. The emperor being informed of the transaction, ordered the governor of the province to make inquiry into the fact, and in consequence of it all the persons concerned suffered capital punishment*.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vii, Cap. 13, 14, 15, 16. p. 357, &c.

S E C T I O N IV.

*An Outline of the political Events of the Reign of
Honorius.*

AS we are drawing near to the fall of the Western empire, which makes a distinguished æra in ecclesiastical history, it may not be displeasing to the reader if I give a sketch of the political events of it.

Both the sons of Theodosius being left very young, viz. Arcadius about eighteen years of age, and Honorius not more than eleven, they were committed to the care of able guardians, the elder to that of Rufinus, and the younger to that of Stilicho, who was originally a Vandal, but who had risen by his merit to the command of the army, and had married a niece of Theodosius.

Stilicho was successful in his wars against the Goths, who had ravaged Greece ; but by the intrigues of Eutropius, who, on the death of Rufinus, governed in the East, he was there declared a public enemy, the governors of the two parts of the empire being then jealous of each other. At the persuasion of Eutropius, Gildo, who commanded

manded for Honorius in Africa, revolted against him, but he was reduced by Stilicho.

A. D. 387, Alaric the Goth, invaded Italy, but being defeated by Stilicho at the battle of Pollentia, he quitted it. After this battle Honorius abolished the shews of gladiators, which, though forbidden by Constantine, had been tolerated by his successors.

A. D. 405, Italy was again invaded by Alaric and Rhadagaisus the pagan, with an army of not less than two (some say four) hundred thousand men, but they were completely defeated by Stilicho with little loss. Rhadagaisus was taken and put to death, and his immense army was totally destroyed and dispersed.

A. D. 407, the Roman army in Britain chose Constantine for their chief, and he soon made himself master of Gaul and Spain ; and Honorius, unable to oppose him, acknowledged him as a partner in the empire. About the same time Stilicho having instigated Alaric to invade Italy, his treachery was discovered, and he was put to death, being succeeded by Olympius.

The next year Alaric advanced and laid siege to Rome, but on the promise of a sum of money he retired. The sum not being paid, and being joined by Athaulphus, who had married his sister, he went to Rome again, and being received by the
inhabi-

inhabitants, he made Attalus emperor. Honorius, however, being assisted by Theodosius the younger, who had succeeded his father Arcadius, A. D. 408, continued in Ravenna, and Alaric being offended with Attalus, deposed him. But the inhabitants of Rome refusing to admit him into the city, he took and plundered it, A. D. 410. After this Alaric retired into Campania, and soon after died, leaving Athaulphus his successor. About the same time Constantine invaded Italy, but being defeated in Gaul, he and his son were put to death.

A. D. 412, the Gauls left Italy, and the year following Heraclianus revolted in Africa; but flying at the approach of the troops sent to reduce him, he was put to death at Carthage. From this time Honorius enjoyed the empire in quiet till his death, A. D. 424, after a reign of twenty eight years from the death of his father.

Honorius, like his brother Arcadius, was a well meaning and pious, but a weak prince, utterly unequal to the conduct of the empire, in the precarious situation in which it then was; and Italy and all the countries subject to him, were grievously exhausted by the wars in which he was engaged, and especially by the neglect of agriculture,
and

and the famines which were occasioned by those wars. He was succeeded by his son Valentinian III. at that time only five years old.

S E C T I O N V.

Events relating to Heathenism.

THE heathens, seeing the desolation of the empire by the invasion of the northern nations, said that it was owing to the disuse of their rites, and the prevalence of another religion than that under which it had risen and flourished; and this gave occasion to that excellent treatise of Austin, *Of the City of God*, in which he shewed the vanity of the heathen religion, and how ill founded this opinion was. But there was at this time a much more effectual confutation of it in the event of the war with Rhadagaisus.

He had revolted from Honorius, ravaged Pannonia, and entering Italy A. D. 405, with the prodigious army mentioned above, threatened to plunder Rome. As he was an heathen, and very superstitious, never failing to sacrifice to his gods every

every morning, the heathens, who were still in great numbers in the city, gave out that he would certainly succeed, and said that nothing could save them but abolishing christianity, and restoring the religion of their ancestors. Indeed the christians were greatly terrified at this invasion. But the total defeat of Rhadagaisus by Stilicho, one half of his army perishing by famine, and the other falling by the sword, together with the death of this barbarian and his son, was an effectual confutation of that opinion of the heathens, concerning the support which the empire received from the ancient religion.

The heathens, uneasy, as Austin says, at the long duration of the christian religion, gave out that an oracle had declared that the ancient religion would be restored, and christianity abolished every where three hundred and sixty five years after its promulgation, which he says ought to have expired A. D. 398*. But on the contrary, that year was peculiarly unfavourable to heathenism, in consequence of the orders of the christian emperors to demolish the temples, and destroy the idols. It was in this year that Gaudentius and Jovius, by the order of Honorius, destroyed the temples and images in Carthage, sparing only

VOL. II.

I i i

those

De civitate Dei, Lib. xviii. Cap. ult. Opera,
Vol. v: p. 1131.

those which either served for the ornament of the city, or were capable of being converted into christian churches.

One of these temples dedicated to the goddess Coelestis, or Astarte, "was exceedingly magnificent, and of prodigious magnitude, and was encompassed by the temples of all the gods. The place," says some African writer, quoted by Dr. Lardner, "was surrounded with beautiful walks, the streets well paved with stones and adorned with pillars; the whole not much less than two miles in compass. Having been shut up some time before, and after that neglected, it was grown over with thorns and thistles. When the christians proposed to apply it to the use of their own religion, the heathens exclaimed against it, and said that there were dragons and asps which guarded the temple, so that it would be dangerous to come near it. But the christians, instead of being terrified, were the more animated with a desire to clear the ground, and to consecrate the place to the truly heavenly king their Lord*, alluding to the former dedication of this temple to Coelestis, or the queen of heaven.

In general the heathens made no opposition to the demolition of their temples, but when, about the

* Lardner's Testimonies, Vol. iv. p. 431.

the time of this transaction, a temple of Hercules was attacked by the christians at Sufferta, a Roman colony in Africa, the heathens resisted and killed at least sixty christians. However the image of Hercules was destroyed.

Another disturbance on this occasion happened at Calama A. D. 408 or 409, soon after the law, enacted by Honorius in which the solemnities of the heathens were expressly forbidden; the account of which is thus given by Austin: " On the
 " first day of June, in contempt of the laws lately
 " enacted, the heathens celebrated one of their sacrilegious solemnities, without prohibition from
 " any, passing through the streets, and dancing
 " before the church in an insolent manner, not
 " practiced even in the times of Julian; and when
 " some ecclesiastics attempted to interrupt them,
 " they threw stones against the church. About
 " eight days after, when the bishop put the chief
 " men of the city in mind of the laws of which they
 " were not ignorant, and when they were going to
 " take some care of the affair as the laws directed, those
 " insolent people again threw stones at the church.

" The next day the ecclesiastics went to the
 " magistrates, desiring to enter a process against
 " them, but were refused. On the same day they
 " began to throw stones a third time, and also to
 " set fire to the houses of some of the ecclesiastics,
 and

“ and actually killed one person, the rest conceal-
 “ ing themselves, or making their escape as well as
 “ they could. The bishop hid himself in a private
 “ place, where he heard those who were seeking
 “ for him with a design to kill him, say, that they
 “ had done nothing till they found *him*.”

“ Nestarius, a heathen, and a man of distinc-
 “ tion in the place, hearing of this disturbance, and
 “ apprehensive of the consequences wrote a ref-
 “ pectful letter to Austin, earnestly intreating for
 “ mercy, To this he replied, that he and the o-
 “ ther bishops were disposed to shew all the gentle-
 “ ness that became christians ; but that it was ne-
 “ cessary to inflict such punishment as might
 “ be sufficient to deter others from following so bad
 “ an example.” Whether any punishment was
 inflicted is not said, but the greatest friend of uni-
 versal toleration must acknowledge that such fla-
 grant breaches of the peace as this was, on what-
 ever pretence committed, ought to be restrained by
 proper punishments.

* Lardner's Testimonies, Vol. iv, p. 425.

S E C

SECTION VI.

Of the Arians in this Period.

IT happened in the time of Chrysostom that the Arians not being allowed to hold any assemblies within the city, but only without the gates, gained much popularity by their singing, in which they exercised themselves every Saturday and Sunday, on which there were assemblies for public worship. This they did principally at the gate of the city in a manner which appears to have been particularly pleasing, one part of the company singing one verse and another the next, and so alternately through the whole piece. This they would often do a great part of the night ; and very early in the morning they would march in procession through the middle of the city, singing all the way till they came to the place of their assembly without the gates ; and in these hymns the Trinitarians were often reflected upon, as they would frequently say, but in Greek verse, “ *where are they who make three powers into one, &c.* ”

Chry-

Chrysoftom being alarmed at this, and fearing lest the more simple of the catholics should be impressed with it, engaged a party of his own people to do the same ; and as the hymns of these catholics were sung with more parade than those of the Arians, being attended with silver crosses and wax lights, the expence of which was defrayed by the empress, the Arians who excelled the other singers in number, were provoked at this opposition ; and the two parties, after much contention no doubt, having at length recourse to arms (in which it is most probable that they who had the countenance of the ruling powers would be the aggressors) some were killed on both sides, and Briso, the empress's eunuch, who instructed the orthodox singers, was wounded in the forehead with a stone. On this account the emperor forbade the singing of the Arians*. To have been impartial, the singing of both the parties should have been prohibited.

The Arians were in great numbers at Synnada in Phrygia in this reign, and the persecution of them by Theodosius, the catholic bishop of the place, had a very singular effect. For Agapetus their bishop persuaded his followers to become Consubstantialists, and being more beloved than Theodosius, he was immediately chosen bishop by both

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 8, p. 321.

both the parties. Atticus, the bishop of Constantinople at this time, considering the event as favourable to the catholic cause, confirmed him in the see, and persuaded Theodosius to bear his exclusion with patience*. It is to be observed that these Arians were Macedonians, who differed little more than in words from the Consubstantialists, and who, as we have seen, had made no difficulty of uniting with them on a former occasion.

In this reign Dorotheus, the bishop of the Arians at Constantinople, died at the advanced age of one hundred and nineteen years, and was succeeded by Barba, in whose time the Arians appeared to advantage, in consequence of having two men of great eminence among them, Timotheus and George, of whom the latter was the best skilled in Greek literature, and the former in the knowledge of the scriptures, which he was able to read in Hebrew. The historian Socrates was acquainted with Timotheus, and admired the readiness with which he explained the difficult passages in scripture; but he wondered that these two men should continue Arians, when one of them was a great admirer of Plato, and the other of Origen, both whose principles he thought unfavourable to their doctrine. He says, however, that they greatly

* Socratis Lib. vii. Cap. 3. p. 348.

greatly improved upon the system of Arius, leaving out many of its impieties and blasphemies. But as this writer does not explain himself, it does not appear in what particulars they varied from Arius, or his followers*.

∴ The Arians in Italy hoped that Attalus would favour them, because he had been baptized by Sigefarius the bishop of the Goths, and was a man esteemed by Alaric, who, like the rest of his nation, was an Arian. But this nominal empire of Attalus was of short duration. For Alaric, who had made him emperor, soon deposed him again†.

S E C T I O N VII.

Of the Novatians.

THE Novatians continued to be very numerous in this period, and the catholics, notwithstanding their agreement with them in so essential an article as that of the doctrine of the Trinity, did every thing in their power to suppress them.

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 6, p. 351.

† Sozomeni Hist. Lib. ix, Cap. 9, p. 375.

them. Chrysostom could not forbear threatening Sisinnius the Novatian bishop of Constantinople, that he would silence him as an heretic, saying there ought to be only one bishop in one city*. Cyril, who succeeded Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, was still more violent. He shut up all the churches of the Novatians in that city, and took from them all their sacred vessels and ornaments. He even stripped Theopemptus their bishop, as Socrates says, of all his own effects†.

Notwithstanding these hardships, the affairs of the Novatians, in Constantinople at least, prospered greatly after the death of Sisinnius, as well as before. Indeed, there seems to have been a succession of excellent men at the head of their churches in this metropolis, and men who were very deservedly in great favour at court, and with the people in general though the catholic bishops took much umbrage at them. Sisinnius, whose wish was always to his people, had on his death bed recommended Chrysanthius to succeed him. He was the son of Marcian, who had been bishop of the Novatians before Sisinnius, had acquired great reputation by his military services, had been consul, and the emperor's vicar in Britain, and on his return to Constantinople was candidate for the office.

VOL. II.

K k k

of

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vi, Cap. 22, p. 341.

† Ibid Lib. vii, Cap. 7. p. 352.

of præfect of the city. His case was remarkably similar to that of Ambrose at Milan. For, like him, who had also held high offices in civil life, Chyrysanthius was with much difficulty prevailed upon to accept the bishoprick, and he distinguished himself as much by his faithful discharge of the duties of it afterwards ; so that he added much to the credit of the Novatians in Constantinople. Out of own fortune he contributed to the support of the poor ; and he never received from the church more than two loaves, which were offered for the communion service every Lord's day. Out of his zeal to promote the interest of his sect, he engaged Ablabius a rhetorician, whose elegant orations were much admired, to be his presbyter, and who was afterwards bishop of the Novatians at Nice*.

The Novatians suffered at Rome as much as they did at Alexandria through the jealousy and arrogance of the catholic bishops, Anastasius first, and afterwards Celestinus, doing the same that Cyril did. For they deprived the Novatians of their churches in that city, and obliged them to hold their assemblies in private houses. Till that time the Novatians had flourished much at Rome, having possession of many churches, with large congregations.

* Socrates Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 12, p. 356.

SECT. VIII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 459

gations. But at Constantinople the catholics acted a more generous part, and behaved towards them as brethren*.

SECTION VIII.

Of the Donatists.

IN Africa the Donatists continued to give as much trouble in this as in any former period. In A. D. 411, there was a solemn conference between them and the catholics at Carthage, seven bishops being chosen on each side to manage the debate. On the part of the catholics the principal was Austin, and on that of the Donatists was Petilian bishop of Cirtha ; and eight bishops were appointed to write. The acts of this conference are preserved, but they are not interesting at present, especially as it had no good effect, and things remained in the same state after the conference as before it. The Donatists did not desire the conference, but were compelled to it by the order of the emperors ; and when they did meet
refused

* Socratis Lib. vii, Cap. 9. p. 354. Cap. 11. p. 386.

refused to sit in company with their adversaries, considering them as profane persons; and through the whole debate they resolutely maintained that theirs was the only true church. However Marcellinius the emperor's deputy, and who was the umpire in the debate (how fair an one may easily be imagined) declared in favour of the catholics; and by the sentence of this court, the Donatists were deprived of their churches, and punished in various other ways. His successor, Dulcitius, pursued these unhappy people with the same violence, banishing them from the country, in consequence of which many of them are said to have destroyed themselves.

Gildon, who revolted from Honorius in Africa, having taken the part of the Donatists, they are said to have committed great ravages upon the catholics, and to have massacred many bishops and presbyters; in consequence of which a law was made to punish those outrages with death. Petilian above mentioned complained of this law as a persecuting one, but Austin properly replied, that robbers and murderers ought always to be punished. This Petilian was a learned and eloquent man, and wrote many books in defence of his sect, and among others an instruction for their clergy, which was much admired. Austin was indefatigable in opposing the Donatists by conferences

ences, preaching, and writing, and his success was very considerable. By one means or other, however, they were so far reduced in his time, that we hear very little of them afterwards*.

There seems to have been no reason why the Donatists might not have been tolerated as well as the Novatians, from whom they differed very little, especially as they were orthodox with respect to the doctrine of the trinity. It was persecution that made them desperate, so that the long continuance of this schism and all the mischiefs which arose from it, must be ascribed to the catholics.

Several councils were held in Africa in this period, especially one in A. D. 398, when two hundred and fifteen bishops met at Carthage, and made one hundred and four canons; but as, like the decrees of most other provincial synods, they relate chiefly to matters of interior discipline, I do not think it necessary to trouble my readers with the particulars.

* Suet., A. D. 398.

SECTION IX.

Of the Pelagian Controversy.

IT was in the reign of Honorius that the Pelagian controversy took its rise, a controversy which produced such lasting consequences in the Western part of the world, though they were but little known in the East. To this we owe the doctrines of *original sin*, *predestination*, and that of the necessity of *supernatural grace* to every good thought, word, or action, and ultimately that of *atonement*; doctrines of which we find no trace in any former period, but which notwithstanding took the deepest root in the christianity of the Latin church, and which were so far from being removed by the reformation under Luther, that they were much strengthened by that means, and carried farther than before, in order to oppose the popish doctrine of *merit* as the foundation of the doctrines of *supererogation* and *indulgencies*.

Pelagius was a British monk (his original name probably *Morgan*, which he translated into Greek) a man of excellent understanding, learning, and
good

SECT. IX. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 463

good morals, who came to Rome in company with Celestius, an Irish monk, a little after A. D. 400. Offended at the superstition of the times, and especially at the notion of the mere act of *baptizing* washing away sin, he set himself to oppose it; maintaining that it was *good works*, and not *water*, that washed away sin. As one principal argument in favour of his doctrine, he alledged that the design of baptism could not be to wash away sin, since it was applied to infants, who had not sinned. This doctrine, so agreeable to good sense, and the plain tenor of the scriptures, gave no offence at Rome, where it was first preached.

From Rome these two monks went to Africa, and thence Pelagius proceeded to Palestine, where he was well received by John the bishop of Jerusalem. But his friend Celestius, preaching the same doctrine in Africa, excited the attention, and at length the utmost indignation, of Austin, the great oracle of that country, and indeed of his age, and of future ages.

This great man was shocked, as he says, to hear it advanced that baptism was not applied for the remission of sins, which is so contrary to the very words of scripture. From this it is evident that the notion of the baptismal water itself really washing away sin, which we have seen to have prevailed in the time of Constantine, had taken firm
bold

hold on the minds of christians in general, since such a man as Austin did not escape its influence. It does not appear, however, that Austin, or any other person, had given due attention to the necessary consequences of this superstitious and absurd opinion before this time ; and they might have remained unknown for ages, if it had not been for the controversy that followed on this subject between Austin and Pelagius. For Austin himself, as well as all other christian writers on the subject of morals, and especially those who wrote against the Manichæans (who held that some souls were necessarily wicked) had advanced doctrines utterly inconsistent with what he maintained afterwards ; saying that every man has a power to do the will of God, and to render himself acceptable to him.

But now, having to maintain the literal meaning of *baptism washing away sin*, and children having no sin of their own to be washed away by it, he said that they had *original sin* (a name and thing intirely unknown before) as they derived some defilement from Adam, from whom they were descended. Still however, he did not say, with his followers in a much later period, that Adam was the constituted representative of his whole race, so that the guilt of his particular transgression was transferred to them, and that they were properly answerable

answerable for it. For the absurd ideas of *imputed guilt* and *imputed righteousness* were as yet unknown. But he thought that a natural *proneness to sin*, which might be called *defilement*, was derived from Adam to all his posterity.

In consequence of this he was obliged to maintain that, till this sinfulness was done away, men had no power to do the will of God, and that this power could only be the gift of God, or his special *grace*, imparted at baptism. It was not therefore through life by any proper power of men's own, but only by the aid of this superadded and supernatural grace, that any man could do what was pleasing to God.

It does not appear to have shocked this great and good man that, upon this scheme, all the heathens must have been left in a state of damnation. But he owned that their good works (which however he sometimes called *shining sins*) were not only intitled to reward in this life, but would lessen their future torment. The case of children dying unbaptized in infancy was still more puzzling upon this new system. For though it has not at all shocked some of Austin's followers, to think that a new born child should be destined to suffer the extreme pains of hell fire to all eternity, no person of the age in which Austin lived was at all prepared to receive it. However, as it was evident that their

original sin had not been washed away, he could not, with any consistency with his new doctrine, maintain that they would be in the condition of those who had no sin. He therefore said that their sufferings would be so light, that their condition would be preferable to non-existence.

Before this controversy Austin had maintained, sensibly enough, that in the future state infants would not be the proper subjects either of reward or of punishment, and therefore that when they entered upon it, it would neither be in a state of happiness nor misery ; thinking, probably, that, as they had not gone through a state of trial or discipline here, they would hereafter.

As Austin could not deny that many persons who had been baptized became afterwards very wicked, and therefore could not be supposed to go to heaven ; not to give up his doctrine of *baptism washing away sin*, he distinguished between *regeneration*, of which all who were baptized partook, and the capacity of *final salvation*, to which *perseverance* in virtue would alone intitle them. But since, in order to support his doctrine of original sin, he had maintained that by the fall of Adam all men had lost the power of doing the will of God, and of rendering themselves acceptable to him, and consequently that every good thought, word, and work must be ascribed to supernatural
grace

grace (which of course was the gift of God, and which, antecedently to good works, no man was intitled to more than another) this great man was reduced to the farther necessity of maintaining that *persevering grace*, and consequently that *salvation* which was the consequence of it, was the sovereign and arbitrary gift of God, to those whom before the foundation of the world he thought proper to predestinate to eternal life, while all the rest of mankind were, without any faults of theirs, left in a state of *reprobation*, and of course doomed to everlasting punishment.

Shocking as these opinions are, and novel as they were in the age of Austin, his ingenuity was at no loss for arguments to support them, and especially from the epistles of Paul; and his authority was so great, that after some time, and with some modifications, they were universally received in the Latin church.

To this very day this system, so fatal to virtue, if it were properly pursued, does not fail to recommend itself to many humble and pious persons, by its seeming to take from the *pride of man*, and to give all glory to God. This history, however, furnishes a remarkable instance of the many important consequences which sometimes follow from single and unguarded positions, and consequently ought to be a standing warning to us to give the
most

most rigorous attention to *first principles*, as to *seeds*, from which great and unknown things may arise. Who would have imagined that from the superstitious notion of *baptism washing away sin*; christianity would ever have been loaded, and disgraced, with such doctrines as *original sin*, absolute *predestination*, with its consequence *reprobation*, and also with the doctrine of *atonement* in its highest sense, (or that the sufferings of an infinite being are necessary to expiate the sins of men) and of men's being saved, not by any works of their own, but by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them.

I shall not give the particulars of this memorable controversy, observing only that Austin procured the opinions of his adversary to be condemned in a council held at Carthage, A. D. 412. But notwithstanding this the Pelagian doctrine was, for some time, received with great applause: at Rome, Zozimus the bishop of Rome, being a favourer of it; nor was Austin's doctrine of predestination in particular confirmed by any council within a century after his death. For though it was defended by the most celebrated divines in the West, particularly by Prosper and Hilary bishops in Gaul, it was never generally received in the East.

It

It also met with particular opposition in the southern parts of France, which was owing in a great measure to the popularity of Cassian, a native of Scythia, and a disciple of Chrysostom, who after the fall of his master, came to Rome, and afterwards settled in Gaul, and founded two monasteries in the neighbourhood of Marseilles. Cassian, however, was no advocate for the doctrine of Pelagius in its full extent, but maintained a doctrine which soon got the name of *Semipelagianism*.

Pelagius himself had asserted that mankind derive no injury whatever from the fall of Adam, and he denied the necessity of *internal grace*. But Austin's doctrine of some moral depravity affecting all mankind in consequence of the sin of Adam, and that of the necessity of supernatural grace to human virtue, was generally acceptable. These, therefore, were admitted by the Semipelagians. But to avoid the doctrine of *predestination*, which we have seen to be the natural consequence of the other, they held that, notwithstanding the necessity of divine grace, the imparting of it depended upon ourselves. They therefore said that it was not necessary to the first beginning of repentance, but only to our progress in virtue; and that all the predestination to eternal life which is mentioned in the scriptures, is upon the foresight of those good works

works which make men the proper subjects of future happiness.

I must observe, however, that the doctrines of Austin (though it is no wonder that many persons should be staggered at them, and receive them with difficulty) necessarily follow from those first principles which the Semipelagians admitted. For if divine grace be necessary to any act of virtue, it certainly must be so to the *first*, which of course is the most difficult of any ; and if the imparting of *that* depend upon the arbitrary will of God, all the virtues of a man's life, and consequently his final happiness, must be equally dependant upon it. There is therefore no proper medium between the doctrines of Austin and those of Pelagius.

As there are only a few more particulars in the history of this controversy, which fall within the compass of my work, I shall not make a separate article of them, but just mention them here. Pelagius and his friend Celestius, being overborne by the authority of Austin, were in a manner obliged to leave the continent of Europe, and they retired to Britain, where their tenents had found a favourer in Agricola, the son of Severian. To counteract them Germanus bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus of Troies were deputed

puted by a synod in Gaul, to go over to Britain; and this mission had all the effect that could have been expected from it. However, upon their return Pelagianism prevailed so much again, that seven years afterwards, it was thought necessary that Germanus should visit Britain once more; and he was then accompanied by Severus the bishop of Triers, the disciple of Lupus, bishop of Troies. And they exerted themselves so effectually, that it is said the Pelagians were banished the island, by the consent of all the inhabitants.*

Whatever was the fate of the proper Pelagians, the Semipelagians had respectable advocates in Vincentius bishop of Lirins, and Gennadius, both of them writers of eminence. Their great opponent was Prosper.

* Bede, Lib. i, Cap. 17. p. 18, &c. Suetor, A. D. 429.

SECTION X.

Of the Writers in the Time of Theodosius and his Sons.

THIS period abounded with writers, and some of them were men of considerable eminence and reputation, and those in the West were superior in general to the christian writers in that part of the world, in the former period.

Of Ambrose mention has been made in the course of the history, as a man of singular courage and probity. He was a native of Rome, but of Gallic origin. On his being appointed bishop of Milan, he sold all his estates for the use of the poor, and applied himself wholly to sacred literature, in which he was a great proficient, and became a voluminous writer. In his tracts on this subject he appears to have been a strenuous defender of the doctrine of the trinity, in favour of which he produced many new and singular arguments, or rather illustrations, which were adopted by his disciple Austin, and which may be seen in my *History of early Opinions concerning Christ*. Besides his

tracts

tracts relating to the doctrine of the trinity, which are three books concerning the Holy Spirit, five concerning faith, and a discourse on the incarnation, we have of his six books on the sacraments, and as many on the work of the six days, an exposition of twelve psalms, and a variety of miscellaneous pieces.

Jerom was born at Stridon in Pannonia. When he was a boy he studied grammar under Donatus at Rome, and rhetoric under Victorinus. Being determined to learn Hebrew, he was at a great expence in procuring Jewish teachers, and was the only christian of his age who was master of that language. He travelled through Gaul with Bonosus, a man of fortune, and a companion of his studies, examining all the libraries in their way; and at Aquileia, he contracted a friendship with Rufinus, a presbyter of that place. Arriving at Antioch, he made choice of the monastic life; and residing four years in a solitude between Syria and Arabia (where he was supported at the expence of Evagrius, a rich citizen of Antioch, in whose company he had travelled from Aquileia through Dalmatia, Thrace, and several provinces of Asia) he applied himself diligently to study, and there he began to write.

A. D. 378, he was made a presbyter by Paulinus of Antioch, and going to Constantinople, a

little before the general council there, he attached himself to Gregory of Nazianzum. In 382, Paulinus and Epiphanius took him with them to Rome, where he lived three years with Paula a woman of high rank and great piety, and there he acted as secretary to Damasus the bishop. Thence he went to Cyprus, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Egypt, where he became a hearer of Didymus, the celebrated defender of the doctrine of the trinity in that country ; and at length he settled at Bethlehem, where he composed the greater part of his works. Here he had a violent quarrel with Rufinus, and John bishop of Jerusalem, on account of the principles of Origen, which they defended. He also entered deeply into the Pelagian controversy. But though he was strictly orthodox with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, he wrote nothing of consequence on that subject.

The greatest part of the writings of Jerom are commentaries on the scriptures. But besides these, we have of his a catalogue of the ecclesiastical writers, the lives of Paul the hermit, of Hilari-
on, and of Malchus, and a great number of letters, many of which are controversial, and in favour of the monks, as those against Jovinian and Vigilantius, which are written with very unbecoming asperity. Jerom was the most learned of all the christians of his age, being acquainted with Latin,
Greck,

Greek, and Hebrew, and he was a man of great ability, but of a violent temper, and too much attached to the monkish maxims. For so voluminous a writer, his works are of little real value.

Rufinus, first the friend, and then the adversary of Jerom, was a native of Aquileia, where he was made presbyter. Making choice of the monkish life, he went to Egypt, where he became conversant with the monks of Nitria, and with Didymus of Alexandria ; but suffering much from the Arians, he removed to Palestine, where being aided by the wealth of Melania, with whom he had travelled into the East, he founded a monastery, and there he spent about twenty five years, hospitably receiving those, who, for the sake of religion, made pilgrimages to Jerusalem. Returning to Rome with Melania, A. D. 397, he translated the works of Origen into Latin ; but rendering himself obnoxious on this account, and being likewise accused of plagiarism, in that respect, he withdrew to Aquileia, where he wrote his books against Jerom. Being condemned as an heretic by Damasus bishop of Rome, and his native city being laid waste by Alaric, he retired to Sicily, A. D. 410, and died there in the year following.

Rufinus was one of the very few of the Latins who understood Greek, and almost the only one who took the pains to translate the writings of the
Greeks

Greeks into Latin. By this means we have now several of the works of Origen, which are not extant in the language in which they were written. But he is not thought to have translated exactly or faithfully. Indeed he professed to alter what was most offensive in the works of his author. Rufinus's own works consist of commentaries on several parts of scripture, an exposition of the apostle's creed, and two books of ecclesiastical history; but they are not of much value.

Paulinus was a native of Rome, of a patrician and consular family from Gaul. His preceptor, Ausonius, being appointed tutor to the children of Gratian, he came to Rome along with him, and there he pleaded causes, and A. D. 375, was advanced to the consulship. The next year he travelled through most of the Western provinces, where he contracted an intimacy with Ambrose, Martin of Triers, and other considerable persons. After spending fifteen years in this excursion, he was made a presbyter by Eulampius bishop of Barcelona, in Spain, the people almost forcing him to accept that honour; and afterwards going to Nola in Campania, he was made bishop of that city. He was a man of great piety and charity, so that when the Goths plundered Campania, he expended all his fortune in redeeming captives. He also laid out great sums in ornamenting his church
with

with pictures and statues. His works consist of *epistles*, several of which are addressed to Sulpicius Severus, and of *poems*.

Austin who was one of the greatest men, as well as the most voluminous writer, of his age, was a native of Tagasta in Numidia, where his family was of considerable rank, and his mother Monica was remarkable for her piety and virtue. He distinguished himself so much by his application to literature, that when he was very young he taught grammar in his native city, and rhetoric at Carthage. For some time he frequented the bar, and then became a Manichæan. But being tired of the wrangling of the lawyers, he, much against the will of his mother, went to Rome, where he had pupils, and thence he was sent by Symmachus the præfect of the city to teach rhetoric at Milan, in consequence of an order which he had received from the emperor to send some able person thither in that character.

At Milan Austin became intimately acquainted with Ambrose, who contributed much to wean him from his attachment to Manichæism. But he himself acknowledges that he was reconciled to the doctrine of the trinity by reading the works of Plato, which had been translated into Latin, and that otherwise he should have embraced
ed

ed the doctrine of Photinus, and have thought that Christ was a mere man.

Returning to Africa, and being at Hippo upon some business A. D. 391, he was with much difficulty prevailed upon to accept the office of presbyter ; and, contrary to the custom which had prevailed in Africa, Valerius the bishop of that city employed him in preaching ; and in this capacity he distinguished himself so much, that, contrary also to universal custom, he was at the request of the bishop, and with much reluctance on his own part, ordained bishop along with him. This was an extraordinary measure which that church took from their fear of losing a man whom they so highly valued.

In this distinguished rank Austin was, in the language of the Apostle, *in labours most abundant*, and in all the duties of the episcopal office most exemplary. Besides being principally concerned in all the councils of Africa, which were numerous in his time, he wrote more books than any other man of his age, most of them controversial, against the Manichæans, Donatists, Pelagians, and all who were called heretics. To Promote learning among his clergy, he formed them into a collegiate body, and subjected them to a regular discipline, similar to that of the monasteries ; and this excellent example was followed by other churches, which

which on this account were called *collegiate* ones. He died during the siege of Hippo by the Vandals A. D. 430, at the age of seventy six.

I do not propose to enumerate all the writings of Austin that are now extant, but shall content myself with mentioning the principal of them. Besides his works of controversy (among which is a large treatise on the doctrine of the trinity, in fifteen books, in which he maintains the perfect equality of three persons) he wrote a most excellent work against the heathens, intitled *De Civitate Dei*, which is one of the most learned and valuable productions of christian antiquity. His other works are commentaries on several parts of scripture, *Meditations*, *Confessions*, consisting of a most candid and instructive account of the principal incidents of his life (in which it is much to be wished that more persons had followed his example) as also in his *Retractions*, a work written late in life, in which with the greatest frankness he acknowledges, and corrects the mistakes he had made in his earlier productions. Besides these we have of his a great number of small tracts, and many epistles.*

Sulpicius

* In Austin's time a canon was made, that no bishop should use any prayer in his church, but such as had been first examined and approved by his fellow bishops in council. Bingham p. 610.

Sulpicius Severus was a native of Aquitania in Gaul, and of a noble family. In his youth he studied eloquence, and acquired considerable reputation at the bar, but after this he became a presbyter of Primulia, and was intimate with Martin of Triers, Paulinus, and Jerome. At one time he was a Pelagian, but afterwards a catholic, though a favourer of the doctrine of the Millenarians. He wrote, in very elegant Latin, a concise ecclesiastical history, from the beginning of the world to A. D. 400; the life of Martin, above mentioned; three dialogues, one on the virtues of the monks, and two concerning those of Martin; and likewise several epistles.

John Chrysostom, whose history has been given in the course of this work, was the most distinguished of all the Greek Fathers, as Austin was among the Latins. The greatest part of his writings are sermons, or expositions of scripture, delivered as sermons, with practical improvements annexed to them. The most regular of his treatises is a dialogue on the duties of a bishop. But in this, as in all his works, it is evident that he studied eloquence, in which, indeed, he greatly excelled. A serious man cannot help perceiving that a display of his talents was too much an object with Chrysostom. On the contrary, Austin does not appear to have written any thing with
that

that view. He never wrote except when he thought he had something of importance to communicate. We therefore see more of the man, and of the heart, in his writings.

Synefius was a native of Cyrene in Lybia, who was sent on an embassy to the emperor Arcadius, about A. D. 400, to present him with a crown of gold; when he delivered an oration on that subject. About A. D. 410 his fellow citizens pressed him to be their bishop, and though he frankly acknowledged that he could not part with his wife, and that he was not even satisfied with respect to the doctrine of the resurrection, they allowed him his wife, and bore with his scruples. But after he was ordained they had no cause of complaint with respect to his faith. He is reckoned an elegant writer, but his works are not of much value. They are the oration above-mentioned, two books on providence, ten hymns, homilies on the seventy-fourth psalm, several small tracts, and a hundred and fifty five epistles.

482 THE HISTORY OF THE PER. XIII.

P E R I O D XIII.

FROM THE DEATH OF HONORIUS, A. D. 424,
TO THE FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE,
A. D. 475.

S E C T I O N I.

*Of the Nestorian Controversy, till the Council of
Ephesus.*

IT might seem that nothing more could have been done with respect to the doctrine of the trinity after the acknowledgment of the proper deity of Christ, and the perfect equality of all the three persons. But in the reign of Theodosius the second, who succeeded Arcadius, there arose among the catholics another question, the decision of which occasioned as much disturbance as any that had preceded it.

It was no longer doubted among them, [that there was a trinity in the divine nature, or that one of the persons in this trinity, viz. the second, or the *logos*, was united to the man Jesus; so that in Christ there were *two natures*, the divine and the human,

SECT. I. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 483

human. But it had not been fully determined that these two natures made *one person*. There was therefore room for something very like unitarianism under all the forms of orthodoxy. For by considering the two natures of Christ as distinct from each other, it might be said that Christ was properly a man, and that the divine logos dwelled in him, and acted by him ; just as the proper unitarians said that Christ was a mere man, but that God the Father dwelled in him, and acted by him. And this was the Doctrine which, from Nestorius who advanced it, was called *Nestorianism*, and which is professed by a considerable part of the Eastern church to this day.

It may be questioned, however, whether Nestorius ever held this opinion, or had any clear conception of it, at the time that he drew upon him the notice of his brethren. As, on the other hand, it may be questioned whether the catholics themselves held any opinion on the subject that was really different from this, till, in the course of controversy, they came to consider it as heretical. For when it is allowed that there are two natures in Christ, so different as those of *God* and *man*, all the *terms* that could be contrived to express the *manner of their union* must be equally destitute of ideas. Consequently, when the catholics did afterwards

terwards determine that these two natures make but *one person*, they did not, in reality, add any new proposition to their former creed, because no new ideas can be affixed to the terms. We are now therefore to consider what was in fact a mere controversy about *words*; but which was the cause of as much animosity, as if it had related to the most intelligible and the most important of *things*.

Nestorius was a native of Germanicia, who had been made a presbyter of the church of Antioch, where, like Chrysostom, he had acquired great reputation by his learning, his preaching, and his piety; and on the death of Sisinus, A. D. 427, he had succeeded to the see of Constantinople, whither he had brought Anastasius one of his fellow presbyters, and a particular friend of his at Antioch. This Anastasius, in one of his sermons, reproved some of the common people for calling the Virgin Mary *the mother of God*; saying, that it was more proper to call her the *mother of Christ*, for that God could not be the offspring of a human being. Complaint being brought of this to Nestorius, he openly approved of what had been asserted by his presbyter, and added, as it is said, "that a child of two or three months old could not be a god;" meaning that what was born of
Mary

Mary was mere man, though a divine nature was superadded to him afterwards.*

Now in this there was nothing that was really contrary to any thing that had been declared to be orthodox by any council, or any eminent writer, such as Athanasius, Basil, or Gregory of Nazianzum. Because it had not been settled, or, as far as appears, so much as considered, at what time the divine nature was superadded to the human nature in Christ, whether at the moment of his conception in the womb, at the time of his birth, or at any other particular period ; and it is very probable that had the question been proposed at the council of Nice, it would have been thought of little consequence, provided that when Christ began to act in a public character, to preach, and to work miracles, he could be said to be truly *God and man*. For every imaginable consequence would be the same in all these cases ; and all the arguments by which the doctrine of the divinity of Christ had ever been supported have just the same weight on all the suppositions. But human passions, when they interfere, as they did in a very great degree in this business, can make any question to be of importance ; and here it happened that two men of over-bearing and violent tempers met.

For

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 28, 29, 32. p. 380.
Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 2, p. 252.

For such were the characters both of Nestorius, and Cyril of Alexandria, his rival, and chief opponent.

Nestorius, immediately on his arrival at Constantinople, distinguished himself by his zeal against heresy; saying, in his first sermon, delivered in the presence of the court, "Give me, O emperor, the earth free from heretics, and I in return will give you heaven. Conquer the heretics for me, and I will conquer the Persians for you." Within five days after his ordination he drove the Arians to such extremity of despair, by endeavouring to take from them a place in which they held their private assemblies, that they themselves set fire to it, and many of the neighbouring houses were consumed along with it. From this circumstance not only the heretics, but those of his own persuasion, gave him the name of the *incendiary*. He endeavoured to suppress the Novatians, out of envy, says Socrates, of Paul their bishop, who was eminent for sanctity of manners. But the emperor restrained his violence. He also greatly harassed the Quartodecimans in Asia, Lydia, and Caria: and a sedition being excited at Miletus and Sardis, in consequence of this persecution many persons lost their lives in it*.

The

* Socratis Hist. Lib. vii. Cap. 29. p. 378.

The Macedonians were so much harraſſed in conſequence of the orders of Neſtorius, by Antonius, biſhop of Germa, that, out of deſpair and revenge, they conſpired againſt his life and put him to death. And Neſtorius, having obtained this advantage againſt them, perſuaded the emperor to take all their churches from them, and among them that which they had at Conſtantinople, Cyzicum, and many others in the villages about the Hellespont. After this, ſays our hiſtorian, ſome of the Macedonians joined the catholics.

In conſequence of what Neſtorius had maintained concerning Mary not being the *mother of God* but only *of Chriſt*, he was by many charged with holding the opinion of Paul of Samofata and Photinus. But Socrates ſays that, after reading his works he was ſatisfied that he held no ſuch doctrine*. Whatever was the real opinion of Neſtorius at this time, Cyril of Alexandria, who was at enmity with him (*απεχθως ειχε προς αυτον*) as his predecessor Timotheus had been with Chryſoſtom, reproved him by his letters upon the ſubject; and Neſtorius replying to him, a controversy aroſe, in which Celeſtinus, biſhop of Rome took part with Cyril; and in a ſynod held A. D. 430, condemned the doctrine of his adverſary. Cyril alſo called a ſynod of the biſhops of Egypt at Alexandria.

* Socratis Hiſt. Lib. vii. Cap. 32. p. 381.

Alexandria, in which was recited the letter which Celestinus wrote in consequence of the synod at Rome, and also *twelve propositions*, and as many *anathemas*, drawn up by Cyril himself against the doctrine of Nestorius. These being approved by the synod, copies of them were transmitted to Nestorius at Constantinople.

Notwithstanding the resolutions of these synods of Rome and Alexandria, Nestorius made no change in his preaching; and in this stage of the business he had several respectable bishops on his side. John bishop of Antioch was intirely in his interest, thinking that Cyril renewed the heresy of Apollinaris; and Theodoret bishop of Cyrus, the historian, drew up twelve propositions in answer to those of Cyril, the object of which was to shew that he confounded the two natures of Christ, and gave to his human nature the honour that was due to the logos. The emperor himself was so much impressed by the representations of Nestorius and his respectable partizans, that he wrote to Cyril, accusing him of calumny, and of disturbing the peace of the church. Cyril, however, remonstrated, and persuaded him to call a general council to decide concerning the matter in dispute. Accordingly a council was summoned to be held at Ephesus A. D. 431.

SECTION II.

Of the Council of Ephesus, and the Consequences of it.

EPHEBUS not being far from Constantinople, Nestorius was first at the place, Cyril also was there before the time appointed for holding the council ; but John bishop of Antioch did not arrive in time, because he had not been able to collect all the bishops of his diocese. However, without waiting for them, Cyril took the place of president which was thought to be improper, if not unfair, though he might plead that there was no other bishop present whose see was so high in rank as his own, except Nestorius himself, who was the person accused. But in equity, neither the *accused*, nor the *accuser* should have presided, but some indifferent person.

The president and all the other bishops having taken their places, the scriptures, according to the custom of those times, were placed on a throne in the middle of the assembly, as the authority to which they all appealed, and then Nestorius was

called up. But though, since their arrival at the place, he had promised to be ready to attend, yet, since after he had been summoned three times, he did not make his appearance, those who were present proceeded to examine into the business without him. Then, having read the letters of Cyril, of Celestinus, and of Nestorius himself on the subject, and having heard the evidence of what he was said to have declared since his arrival at Ephesus, and which he had declared in his sermons at Constantinople, viz. that “a child of two or three months old could never be a God,” they pronounced sentence of deposition against him, and it was signed by more than two hundred bishops who composed this council.

At this council the twelve propositions of Cyril were confirmed, the substance of which is briefly expressed in the following explication subjoined to them. “The holy virgin is the mother of God, not that the nature of the logos, or the divinity, took its commencement in the holy virgin, but because that sacred body, animated by a reasonable soul, to which the logos of God was substantially united, was carnally born of her.” In other words, the *hypostatical union*, as it was afterwards generally called, of the logos with both the body and the soul of the man Jesus, took place at the moment of conception.

Five days after this arrived John of Antioch with the bishops of his diocese ; and being highly offended at Cyril and the rest for having acted without him, he formed them into a separate synod, and pronounced a sentence of deposition against Cyril and Memnon bishop of Ephesus. Also, some of these bishops being Pelagians, they made a decree in favour of that doctrine. But these two bishops appealing to the members of the original council, who were now joined by legates from the see of Rome, John was summoned to give an account of his proceedings against them ; and not appearing after three days, Cyril and Memnon were absolved from their sentence, and on the other hand John and his bishops were deposed and excommunicated. They also made a decree against the Pelagian doctrine.

At first, Theodosius, being prepossessed by the accounts of Nestorius and his friends, did not approve of his deposition, and at the suggestion of Acacius of Berea, then an hundred years old, he gave orders for the banishment of Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, as equally disturbers of the peace of the church. But the members of the council remonstrating against the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, he ordered seven bishops on each side to appear before him at Constantinople, that

that by hearing both he might form a better judgment in the case. But being prepossessed against Nestorius by his sister Pulcheria, he for some time forbade his friends (of whom John of Antioch was one) to come any nearer than Chalcedon; saying that he would only see the other deputies. He was however so much pressed, that at length he heard them all, but decided against Nestorius. After this, by writing letters to Cyril and John of Antioch, he procured a reconciliation between them, and at length John joined in the deposition of Nestorius. In all this it must be acknowledged that the good natured emperor was governed chiefly by the princess Pulcheria, and as a testimony of her triumph in the cause of the virgin, she built a magnificent church to her honour, at the port of Constantinople*.

We have seen sufficient marks of faction, and of the influence of civil power in many of the preceding councils, and certainly they are no less apparent in this, which has obtained the title of the *third œcumenical or universal, council*, in which the doctrine of the hypostatical union of the two natures of Christ was established. Had John of Antioch and his bishops been present, it is possible that

* Evag. Lib. i, Cap. 4. 5. p. 253. Nycephori Historia, Lib. xv. Cap. 14. Vol. 2. p. 607.

that Nestorius might have been acquitted, and Cyril condemned ; and the signing of the condemnation of Nestorius afterwards was never considered as the result of conviction. The whole business was in fact a contest between Nestorius and Cyril ; and the latter, by taking advantage of the absence of the accused, and of a great proportion of the judges, and what was more than all, having the interest of the princess Pulcheria, gained his point.

Nestorius at first got leave to retire to his own monastery, as he called it, near Antioch. Here he continued four years, and behaved in such a manner as to gain the respect of every body. But this not answering the purpose of his enemies, he was banished to Oasis in Egypt. This place being invaded by a people called Blemmyes, and Nestorius with the other captives being dismissed, he had leave to retire to Panopolis in Thebais. Afterwards he was removed by a guard of soldiers to Elephantina, at the extremity of Thebais. But being much fatigued and harrassed by the journey, he returned to Panopolis, and there he died, his tongue being said to be eaten of worms. This was considered by his enemies as a judgment of God for his blasphemies ; and after dying this horrible death

death in this world, he went, they say, to a more grievous punishment in another*.

To read the solemn degrees of these councils, and the insolent triumphs of those who gained their point in them, one would think them to be omnipotent, and that they had the power of putting an end to all controversies. Cyril, writing to his friend John, bishop of Emesa, after this council of Ephesus, says, "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad. The middle wall of partition is broken down, The contest is at an end. All occasion of discord is removed. Our Lord Jesus Christ has given peace to his church." But the Nestorian heresy, as it was called, was so far from ceasing with this synod, that from this time it spread more than ever; and it prevails in the East to this day.

The Virgin Mary having in this solemn manner obtained the title of *the mother of God*, it is observed that from this time she acquired a greater share of reverence and attention than had ever been given to her before, though she was not regularly worshipped, as she was in a later period.

* Evag. Lib. i. Cap. .7 p. 256.

S E C T I O N III.

Of the Eutychian Controversy till the Death of Theodosius II, A. D. 456.

NOT long after the decision of the Nestorian controversy, viz. A. D. 448, two years before the death of Theodosius, another and opposite heresy, as it is commonly called, broke out, viz. that of Eutyches, an abbot of a monastery near Constantinople, and one of the most zealous opposers of Nestorius. He was accused of holding heterodox opinions concerning the person of Christ, by Eusebius bishop of Dorylæum, who being a professor of rhetoric had before disputed with Nestorius.

A synod of thirty two bishops being assembled at Constantinople to decide this affair, Eutyches at first did not appear, but afterwards he did; and when he was interrogated concerning his opinions, he held that before the union between the divine and human nature of Christ, they were properly *two*, but that after the union had taken place there was only *one nature*. He also maintained
that

that the body of Christ was not of the same nature with that of other men. In consequence of this he was condemned and deposed. Appealing to the emperor, and also to Leo bishop of Rome, and complaining in particular that the acts of this synod had been falsified by Flavianus bishop of Constantinople, another synod was appointed to meet at this city, and Flavianus was heard on the subject. But though the acts of the former synod did not appear to have been falsified, another and more general council was appointed to meet to settle this business at Ephesus*.

At this synod, or council, were present Juvenalis bishop of Jerusalem, Domnus who had succeeded John bishop of Antioch, and Julius a Western bishop, who acted as legate to Leo bishop of Rome; and by the contrivance of Chrysaphius, who had much influence in the court of Theodosius, Dioscorus, who had succeeded Cyril as bishop of Alexandria presided. Flavianus also and the bishops of his diocese were present. But as he and all the bishops who had before condemned Eutyches were now considered as persons accused of irregular proceedings, they were not allowed to have any vote; and the disposition of the emperor in favour of Eutyches being well known, he was restored, and his adversaries, Flavianus and Eusebius

* Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 9. p. 261:

Eusebius of Dorylæum were condemned and deposed, together with Ibas bishop of Edessa, Theodoret of Cyrus, Domnus of Antioch, Daniel of Carrhæ, Irenæus of Tyre, and Aquilinus of Biblos*.

There were, however, great complaints of irregularity and unfairness in the proceedings of this council. A letter which Leo wrote in refutation of the errors of Eutyches was not allowed to be read, so that his legates retired, and protested against the proceedings. It is also said that the bishops who were against Eutyches being refractory, Dioscorus, who favoured him, entered the place of assembly with a number of soldiers, and many monks (who almost universally took the part of Eutyches, as one of their body) with one Barsumas, a man of a violent character, at their head, and by threats and actual force compelled them to adopt their measures; and it was with some difficulty that the pope's legates made their escape and got to Rome. Moreover, not content with deposing, Flavianus, Dioscorus and Barsumas falling upon him with their fists, bruised him in such a manner, that he died in a few days. As a proof that Barsumas intended to murder him, it was al-

* Evag. Lib. i. Cap. 10. p. 261.

leged that he¹ was heard to cry out on the occasion, *kill him, kill him.*^{*}

Theophilus of Alexandria, a disciple of Apollinaris of Laodicea, La Croze says, was the proper author of the doctrine of the Monophysites; but it was farther advanced by Cyril, the nephew of Theophilus. They said that if there be *two natures* in Christ, there must be *two sons*. Synesius was the friend of Theophilus, and was probably the author of the spurious works of Dionysius the Areopagite, and the sentiments of it are Monophysite. They were first cited by Cyril who in his controversies quotes other supposititious writings†. *Histoire du christianisme d'Ethiopie par La Croze, p. 8, &c.*

After the council of Ephesus the doctrine of the Monophysites made great progress. The treatise of Cassian on the incarnation, and the works of Marius Mercator, are written upon those principles; and they would have prevailed, if it had not been for the ignorance and malice of Eutyches, from whose language and conduct it appeared that the matter had been carried too far. Cyril had con-
tented

* Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 18, p. 325.

† Cyril is supposed by La Croze to have been the forger of the book of Athanasius which he quoted as favourable to him, as well as of several others. *Ib.* p. 32.

tented himself with asserting the unity of the two natures of Christ ; but Eutyches maintained that he had but *one nature*. *Histoire du christianisme d'Ethiopie* p. 32.

The business of Eutyches did not end with Theodosius, who died by a fall from his horse in hunting, A. D. 450, after a reign of thirty eight years. He was a prince of great piety, but weak, and consequently governed by those about him. He left only one daughter, who was married to Valentinian III. His sister Pulcheria, who had been declared Augusta and reigned along with him, chose for her husband Marcian, a native of Thrace, on account of his excellent qualifications and great virtues, on condition that he should be content with the empire, and the name only of her husband*.

* Evag. Cap. 1. p. 280.

S E C T I O N IV.

Of the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

THEODOSIUS, who had favoured Eutyches, being dead, the aspect of things with respect to him soon changed. Marcian, presently after his accession, received letters from Leo, bishop of Rome, complaining that his epistle had not been read in the council at Ephesus. Those bishops also who thought themselves injured by Dioscorus, requested that their cause might be heard in a full council, but none of them was so urgent as Eusebius bishop of Dorylæum, who said that himself and Flavianus had been deposed in consequence of the intrigues of Chrysaphius, who had been offended because when he demanded a sum of money for his ordination, he, to shew him the impropriety of his conduct, had sent him the sacred vessels of his church. He also complained that Flavianus had died of the attack that had been made upon him, and also that Chrysaphius and his party were of the same opinion with Eutyches. On this account Marcian summoned a general council to meet at Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

At

At this council, which consisted of three hundred and sixty bishops, there were present the legates of Leo, Anatolius bishop of Constantinople, Dioscorus of Alexandria, Maximus of Antioch, Juvenalis of Jerusalem, and the bishops depending upon them. The legates of Leo began with objecting to Dioscorus having a seat along with them, because without the leave of their master, he had presumed to preside in the council at Ephesus. But this was not allowed to be a sufficient objection, and therefore it was determined that Dioscorus had a right to his seat. In the next place Eusebius desired to be heard against Dioscorus, for having been the cause of the death of Flavianus, and his own unjust deposition, requesting that the council would judge between them.

After these preliminaries, the acts of the council at Ephesus were read, and the case of Dioscorus being examined, it appeared that he had been the cause of the rejection of the epistle of Leo, and of the deposition of Flavianus, by compelling the Fathers of the council to sign a blank paper, to which the sentence of deposition was afterwards prefixed. For these reasons the bishops of this council deposed Dioscorus, and together with him Juvenalis of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia
in

in Isauria, for concurring with him in those unjust proceedings.

In the next place the legates of the Pope having repeated their master's complaints against Dioscorus (to which they added his presuming to excommunicate the Pope, while he himself stood charged by the synod with many great crimes, and receiving those who had been excommunicated for just reasons into his communion) said, "For these reasons the most holy and blessed Leo, archbishop of Rome senior, by us, and the present synod, together with the apostle Peter, worthy of all praise, the basis of the catholic church, and the foundation of the right faith, deposeth him from his episcopal dignity and every clerical office." This sentence, which I recite verbatim as a specimen of the claims of Leo, and of such excommunications as all the bishops of the greater sees in that age passed upon one another, was confirmed by this council, without which it would have had no effect. And those who had been deposed by Dioscorus were restored to their former dignities.

These affairs being dispatched, the Fathers of this council proceeded to the discussion of the articles of faith, the result of which was their condemnation of the opinion of those who said that what was born of Mary was a *mere man*, and their approbation

probation of the synodical letters of Cyril, by which they censured the doctrine of Nestorius. They likewise gave their sanction to the epistle of Leo, sent to the council of Ephesus, as equally confuting those who made *two sons of God* (which was said to be the consequence of the opinion of Nestorius) and those who, with Eutyches maintained that the deity of the Son was liable to suffer ; those who said that there was a mixture or confusion of the two natures of Christ, who said that his flesh was of some celestial substance, or any other than human, or that, though before the union there were two natures of Christ, there was but one after it.

After the solemn condemnation of these particular opinions, they gave a definition of their own faith, in which they acknowledge Christ to be
 “ perfect God and man, consubstantial with the
 “ Father as to his divinity, and consubstantial
 “ with man as to his humanity ; having two na-
 “ tures, without confusion, or one of them being
 “ changed into the other, indivisibly and insepa-
 “ rably united ; the difference of the natures not
 “ being lost in the union, but joined in one per-
 “ son or hypostasis.” It was then determined
 that whosoever should profess any other faith than
 this, if they were bishops, they should be deposed,
 if they were of the inferior clergy, they should be
 degraded.

degraded, and if monks or laymen excommunicated.

In this council, La Croze says, that Nestorius, then in exile, would have been summoned to attend, and would no doubt have been received into communion, if he had not been prevented by death. He had appealed to Leo bishop of Rome, who approved of the confession of faith that he sent him; and in return the letter of Leo was much approved by Nestorius. *Christianisme d'Ethiopie* p. 32.

This being settled, the emperor came to Chalcedon, and entering the place of assembly, he made a speech to the bishops, in which he exhorted them to peace and concord. After this they had other meetings to settle differences between particular persons, and some other matters of less consequence. Theodoret, having pronounced an anathema against Nestorius, whose opinion he was thought to have favoured, was restored to his see; as also was Ibas, in consequence of their rescinding all the decrees of the council of Ephesus, except the ordination of Maximus bishop of Antioch. In the last place it was agreed, that the see of Constantinople should rank next to that of Rome.*

Loe

Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 4. p. 286. Cap. 8. p. 309.

Leo was highly provoked at the decision of this council in favour of the bishop of Constantinople, and vehemently exclaimed against the arrogance and presumption of Anastatius, and though he confirmed the other decrees of the council, he rejected this, pronouncing it absolutely null by the authority, as he said, of the apostle Peter*. He argued that the church of Constantinople was not founded by any apostle, and he thought that the decrees of this council infringed upon those of the council of Nice, which he thought it his duty to defend†. It is evident, however, that he misinterpreted the canons of the council of Nice.

SECTION V.

The Consequences of the Council of Chalcedon till the Death of Marcian A. D. 457.

THE proceedings of this great council, the fourth which has obtained the title of *œcumenical*, or universal, in which the known disposition of the emperor had the same decided influence as in any other preceding council, and the proceed-

VOL. II.

Q q q

ings

* Cave's Hist. Lib. i. Vol. 1. p. 431.

† Dupin Vol. 4. p. 56.

ings of which were in many respects conducted with much clamour and confusion, were far from giving universal satisfaction, especially to the numerous friends of Eutyches and Dioscorus, who was banished to Gangræ in Paphlagonia. Both in Egypt and Palestine there were dangerous insurrections, and much blood was shed in consequence of them. Proterius succeeding to Dioscorus, the friends of the latter rose in arms, and insulted the soldiers and magistrates who were appointed to execute the orders of the council; and when many of the soldiers were obliged to take refuge in a building which had been the temple of Serapis, the people set fire to the place, and burned them in it. Upon this two thousand new raised soldiers were sent to Alexandria, and their irregularities with respect to the wives and daughters of the citizens being the occasion of more mischief than all that had happened before, the people were not pacified till the governor gave way to them, by granting them the usual distribution of corn, and the use of the baths, spectacles, &c. of which they had been deprived on account of this tumult.

Eutyches having gone to the monks in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and complained to them that the true faith had been betrayed at the council of Chalcedon, inflamed them to the highest

est degree. They compelled Juvenalis, who had been restored by this council, to anathematize the decrees of it ; and not content with this, they put in his place a monk of the name of Theodosius who had made much disturbance in the council, and had brought the first news of the issue of it. In this business Theodosius and his friends are said to have committed great outrages, and even many murders. But notwithstanding this, being supported by Eudocia, the widow of the emperor Theodosius (who however is said to have renounced Eutychianism before she died) he held the see of Jerusalem twenty months, and ordained many bishops. At length, the emperor to whom Juvenalis had fled, interposed, and compelled the church to receive him, and to expel the bishops who had been ordained by Theodosius*.

Theodosius himself fled to mount Sinai ; and when his accomplices, joined by Eudocia, wrote to the emperor in his favour, he made a very proper reply ; reproving them for the disorders of which they had been the occasion, and requiring their submission to their bishop Juvenalis, who, he said, had interceded for them.

Marcian, seeing there were persons who endeavoured to extenuate the authority of the council of Chalcedon, made a new edict to support and confirm

* Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 5. p. 292.

confirm it ; and by another edict he cancelled every thing that had been done against Flavianus, and ordered that due honour should be paid to his memory. Not content with this, he issued another edict against the Eutychians by name, in which he subjected them to all the penalties which had been inflicted upon the Apollinarists, forbade them to create bishops, priests, or clergy, to make assemblies of monks to build monasteries, to receive or to bequeath any legacies, or to be enrolled in the army. He banished from the empire the monks belonging to the monastery of Eutyches at Constantinople, and ordered that it should no longer bear his name, because it had served as a retreat to the enemies of religion. He moreover ordered all the books written in favour of that heresy to be burnt, and the authors of them to be banished ; and likewise that those who should teach this heresy should be punished with death, and those who should be assembled to hear it pay a fine of ten pounds of gold.

Notwithstanding all these severe edicts, Eutychianism prevailed more than ever in the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, and there it continues to this day*. Eutychianism was so generally received in Alexandria, that the emperor issued an express edict to oblige all the people of that place

* Suet., A. D. 453,

place to receive the decrees of the four œcumenical councils, viz. those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and subjected the Eutychians to the punishments inflicted on all other heretics.*

On the death of Marcian, after a reign of seven years, Dionysius the military commander, being in Upper Egypt, the people of Alexandria set upon Proterius their bishop, and though he fled into the baptistery of the church, they seized him, and put him to death, together with six other persons. They then dragged his body with ropes, and having insulted it in this manner, burned it. It was said, however, by some that Proterius had brought this upon himself by his own violence, and that he was not killed by the people, but by some soldiers. In his place the people chose for their bishop Timotheus Ælurus, who had been a monk, and was then a presbyter of the church.

* Suet., A. D. 454.

S E C T I O N VI.

Transactions relating to Eutychianism, subsequent to the Accession of Leo the Thracian, A. D. 474.

LEO the Thracian, who had succeeded Marcian, being informed of the disturbances in Egypt, directed a circular letter to all the metropolitan bishops, and also to the Abbots, or heads of monasteries, acquainting them with what had happened, and requiring them to call synods of the bishops of their respective districts, and to give him their opinion concerning the council of Chalcedon, and the ordination of Timotheus. In consequence of this Leo bishop of Rome, and all the other metropolitan bishops, assembled their separate synods; and in all of them the ordination of Timotheus was condemned as irregular, and the decrees of the council of Chalcedon were confirmed. There was, however, one dissenting voice, viz. Amphilochius, bishop of Sida, who disapproved, indeed, of the ordination of Timotheus, but condemned the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, though some time after he acknowledged their authority.

Among

Among the letters which were written on this occasion, and which have been preserved, there is one of Simeon Stylites, a monk, who is said to have lived many years on a pillar, exposed to all the inclemencies of the weather, and to have been highly respected in this superstitious age on that account; and in his letter I find, for the first time, the idea of the spirit of God being present in councils, and influencing their decrees. "If," says he, "our Saviour be present with two or three of his disciples, how much more will the spirit of God be present with so many bishops as were assembled at Chalcedon." In consequence of these proceedings, Timothy was banished to Gangræ, and the people of Alexandria chose another bishop of the name of Timothy, surnamed Basilus according to some, and Salofaciolus according to others*.

That the Eutychian doctrine was popular at Antioch, as well as at Alexandria, is evident from the reception which was there given to Peter Fullo, a presbyter of the church of Chalcedon, but who had been a monk, and who, like the monks in general, was a favourer of Eutyches; but he was said to have been expelled from the monastery for his irregularities. This man however, having the favour of the emperor Zeno (who succeeded Leo, after

* Evag. Lib. ii. Cap. 8, 9, 10, 11. p. 297, &c.

... H E HISTORY OF THE PER. XIII.

after a reign of only ten months) seized upon the see of Antioch, while Martyrius, the regular bishop, was at Constantinople, and he was confirmed in it by the order of the emperor. Before this time it had been the custom of many churches of the East, in imitation, it is supposed, of the form of adoration in Isaiah vi. 3. *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hosts*, and in Revelation iv. 8. *Holy, holy, holy, Lord God almighty*, to prefix, or to add, these words to their hymns, with the addition of other epithets, as follows, "Holy God, holy almighty, holy immortal, have mercy upon us," and by this they imagined that the three persons in the Trinity were characterized. To this *Trisagion* (which this form of invocation was called) Fullo, and probably other monks who were attached to Eutychianism, and who thought that the whole nature of Christ became divine after the union of the two natures (the less being wholly absorbed in the greater, as a drop of oil would be in the ocean) and who consequently maintained that the divine nature of Christ suffered, used to add, "who was crucified for us."

This made Fullo so exceedingly popular, that he not only got himself made bishop of Antioch, but ordained one John bishop of Apamea. And though the emperor ordered Fullo to be banished, and Martyrius to be restored, the latter found the
people

people so much divided, and the majority, no doubt, so greatly against him, that he chose to resign, and contented himself with being a simple presbyter. Fullo, continuing a bishop, openly anathematized the council of Chalcedon, and taught that the divinity suffered on the cross.

Basiliscus, who for some time supplanted Zeno, was the avowed advocate of Eutychianism, and in consequence of circular letters which he wrote for the purpose, no less than five hundred bishops joined in acquitting Eutyches, and in the condemnation of the epistle of Leo, and of the decrees of the council of Chalcedon*. Afterwards, indeed, Basiliscus found himself obliged to retract his circular letter. But still the fact shews that the bishops were always ready to go with the court, that is, to be swayed by their interest, and therefore that the real faith of the christian church in any period, or even the opinions of the bishops themselves, are by no means to be collected from the decrees of these solemn councils. Had the succeeding emperors been disposed to favour Eutychianism, as much as Eudocia, Zeno, and Basiliscus, there can be no doubt but that this famous council of Chalcedon

VOL. II.

R r r

would

* Evag. Lib. iii. Cap. 5. p. 338.

would have been deemed as spurious as the second of Ephesus*.

S E C T I O N VII.

General Observations on the four Occumenical Councils.

WE are now come to the termination of the last four boasted *accumenical* (or *general*) *councils*, the decrees of which have been the standard of orthodoxy, with respect to the doctrine of the trinity, from that time to the present, in all established churches, and which are equally acknowledged by the Greeks and the Latins. I shall therefore in this place give a general retrospective view of the decisions of them.

In the council of Nice it was determined that the Son was *of the same substance* with the Father ;
in

* In the reign of Basiliscus and Zeno the church of St. Sophia, the library of which had been begun by Constantine, and greatly augmented by Theodosius Jun. in whose time it contained more than an hundred thousand volumes, but afterwards one hundred and twenty thousand, was burned by the firing of the city in a popular tumult. Bingham p. 313.

in that of Constantinople, that both the Son and the Holy Spirit are in all respects, *equal* to the Father ; in that of Ephesus, that the *two natures* of Christ make but *one person*, and in that of Chalcedon, that these natures continue to be two, notwithstanding this personal, or hypostatical union between them.

With respect to the doctrine of the two first councils, I would observe that the ideas are clear enough ; as we very well know what is meant by *ameness or substance*, and also by *equality* with respect to power, rank, &c. But the language of the two succeeding councils conveys no distinct ideas at all ; because we cannot possibly conceive how two beings, or substances, so different as those of God, and man, can be properly *united* ; or if they be united, what kind of union it will be ; and though the differences in this case may be distinguished by the words *nature* and *person*, we have no ideas corresponding to that verbal difference.

Nestorius and Eutyches equally maintained that Christ was both *God* and *man* ; but the former was censured for making the God and the man to constitute *two persons*, and the latter for saying that, after this intimate personal union, there was but *one nature*. Since however it is impossible to give any definitions of the terms *person* and *nature* in these propositions, the difference
between

between these two opposite heresies, as they are always called, is merely verbal, so that the controversy is about words only ; and yet for such a difference as this, which it is impossible for any man to understand, or explain, have whole bodies of christians anathematized one another for ages.

I would farther observe, that rational metaphysics would have prevented the decisions of all these celebrated councils ; since where they are intelligible, they are locally speaking, *absurd*, involving real contradictions.

That the Son is of the same substance with the Father, was an inference from his having been originally the proper *reason of the Father*, and afterwards personified. But that any *attribute* should become a *separate person*, and especially that the Being whose attribute it was, should not after this event be deprived of it, is a manifest absurdity. It is still more so to suppose that three persons should be all of them, separately considered, possessed of all the same attributes of divinity, and in the same extent, and yet not be *three Gods*, or three beings possessed of all the requisites of divinity ; because we have no different ideas to annex to the terms *person* and *being* in this case. The same good sense and rational metaphysics would have prevented all disputes about the terms *nature* and *person*,

SEC. VII. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 517

person, in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies.

In fact, if we set aside the doctrine of Arius, or that a great pre-existent intelligent Being, supplying the place of a human soul in the person of Christ (which its late rise alone excludes from all pretensions to be the original and apostolical doctrine) rational metaphysics admit of no other than the simple Unitarian doctrine, of Christ being a man inspired by God. And this is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes of the christian dispensation, and indeed has infinitely greater propriety, and consequently greater effect, than any other scheme whatever; especially as it makes Christ to be, in the proper sense of the words, *the first born among many brethren*, and in all respects like unto them, so as to be a proper pattern of the resurrection of man to a future immortal life; to teach and to exemplify which was the great object of his mission.

Besides, if we say, what this doctrine supposes, that God was properly with Christ, and acted by him, which he himself declared, when he said that *of himself he could do nothing*, and that *the Father within him did the works*, it has the same advantage, and effect, as the supposition of his being God himself; because the *power*, though not the *person*, was that of God. There is therefore no
good

§18 THE HISTORY OF THE PAR. XIII.

good reason for contending that Christ himself, personally considered, should be God, unless it should be maintained that his suffering as a God was necessary to the redemption of the world, which those who hold the doctrine of the divinity of Christ always disclaim; since they acknowledge that he suffered as a man only, the divine nature being incapable of suffering.

It is said, indeed, that the union between these two natures is such, as to give a peculiar value to the sufferings of that part of Jesus which was capable of suffering. But since it is acknowledged not to be so great as to admit of both the natures suffering together, such an union as that which the Unitarians suppose to have been between the supreme God and the man Jesus (which is all the union of which we can form any idea) may, for any thing that we know, be sufficient for this purpose also. But the whole doctrine of atonement for the sins of men by the sufferings of any superior Being whatever, and the supposition that God does not forgive sins *freely*, on account of the repentance and reformation of the sinner (which is the uniform doctrine of the scriptures, and what is always recommended to our imitation) implies the greatest reflection on the character of the supreme Being and when properly attended to must have

an

an unfavourable effect on the minds of his worshippers.

The decisions of these councils had no effect besides what the civil power gave them. Arianism was so far from being extinguished, that it even increased, after the council of Nice, and it continued long after that of Chalcedon. Besides, it was received by all the Northern nations which were not subject to the Roman power. It is equally true that the council of Ephesus was little more than the date of the origin of Nestorianism, and the council of Chalcedon that of Eutychianism; and to this day Nestorianism is the professed doctrine of one part of the East, and Eutychianism of another; and since the fall of the Greek empire, the adherents to these sects are perhaps equal in number to those who are called catholics among the Greeks.

S E C T I O N VIII.

Transactions of a civil Nature in the West, from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the Empire.

WITH the account of this famous council of Chalcedon, which brings the state of opinions with respect to the person of Christ to an important period, I close my history of the Eastern church, and proceed to relate what remains of ecclesiastical transactions in the West. But from the death of Honorius nothing of much importance occurs till after the period to which I now confine myself. I shall therefore do little more than give the outline of what happened after the death of Honorius, that we may see in what manner this great empire (the civil transactions of which had always the closest connexion with the ecclesiastical ones) fell into total dissolution.

On the death of Honorius, John, his chief secretary, assumed the purple in Rome ; but Theodosius, sending an army against him, defeated him, and put him to death, and then declared his cousin Valentinian III. emperor, his mother Placidia being

being regent during his minority. In this reign Boniface who commanded in Africa, being suspected of endeavouring to make himself independant, was induced to revolt, and to invite Genseric king of the Vandals (who were at that time in possession of Spain) to join him. Accordingly, the year following, which was A. D. 439, this prince crossed the sea, and though Boniface, whose innocence had in the mean time been made to appear, would have persuaded him to return, he pursued his advantage till he had reduced the whole country.

A. D. 447, the northern parts of Italy, were ravaged by Attila King of the Huns ; but Valentinian agreeing to pay him an annual pension, he withdrew, and settled beyond the Danube. A. D. 455, Valentinian having debauched the wife of Maximus, one of his officers, the latter entered into a conspiracy against him ; and having put him to death, caused himself to be proclaimed emperor. But having compelled Eudocia, the empress, to marry him, she invited Genseric to invade Italy ; and upon his arrival Maximus fled, and was killed. Genseric plundered Rome, and carried away an incredible number of captives, and among them Eudocia herself.

On the death of Maximus, Theodoric king of the Visigoths, who were then settled in Gaul, caused Avitus who was then an ambassador at his court, to be proclaimed emperor. But when he had reigned scarcely fourteen months he was deposed by Ricimer, who had the command of the Roman fleet, and who had just before defeated that of Genseric. After an interregnum of three months, he proclaimed Majorianus emperor; but being jealous of his reputation, he put him to death, and in about three months advanced Severus, a native of Lucania, to the same dignity. He dying in consequence of poison given him, as supposed, by Ricimer, the latter, after two years, promoted Anthemius, who had married the only daughter of Marcian, to the empire, and married his daughter. A. D. 472 Ricimer revolted from Anthemius, and taking Rome, committed more ravages in it than either Alaric or Genseric had done. He then put Anthemius to death and caused Olybrius to be proclaimed in his room, and he died a natural death not long after, as Ricimer himself did a little before him.

The following spring, A. D. 473, Glycerius, who had been Comes Domesticorum, took the title of emperor at Ravenna. But the year following Julius Nepos, having been proclaimed emperor of the West by Leo emperor of the East, surprised

prized Glycerius, and divesting him of the purple, compelled him to become bishop of Salonæ in Dalmatia. After this Orestes, his general, revolting from him, made his own son Augustulus emperor ; and Nepos being obliged to fly, took refuge with Glycerius. But the barbarians who had served in the Roman armies being refused by Orestes that settlement in Italy, which they had demanded as the reward of their services chose Odoacer for their leader ; and he, besieging Orestes in Pavia, took the place, and put him to death. After this he took Augustulus in Ravenna, but spared him on account of his youth, and then proclaimed himself *king of Italy*, A. D. 473, in consequence of which an end was put to the very name of the *Roman empire* in the West.

S E C.

SECTION X.

*Transactions of an Ecclesiastical nature in the West,
from the Death of Honorius to the Fall of the
Western Empire.*

DURING these commotions and revolutions, little was done in ecclesiastical matters, except what has been mentioned with respect to the Pelagians in Gaul.

The Vandals, who, as well as the Goths, and other northern nations, were Arians, having got possession of Africa, persecuted the orthodox, banishing all the bishops of that persuasion from their sees, as Theodosius in his time treated the Arian bishops in his dominions; and it is said that the Donatists joined the Arians in their persecution of the catholics. The Vandals also persecuted the Manichæans, who took refuge in Rome, where, however, they were vehemently opposed by Leo, who was likewise the great enemy of the Pelagians; and Valentinian the emperor seconding all his views, he called a synod, which ordered all the Manichæans to be punished as heretics. The Vandals, however, were as zealous christians

christians as the catholics ; for it is acknowledged that they destroyed all remains of heathenism in Africa.

The authority of the see of Rome was greatly advanced in this period by Leo, who, countenanced in this, as well as in every thing else by the emperor Valentinian, encouraged appeals to the church of Rome ; and asserting the dignity and prerogatives of it as due to the apostles Peter and Paul, who had been its founders ; alleging that as Peter was the chief and sovereign among the apostles, his successors ought to have been the same among other bishops.

Notwithstanding the emperors had exempted Illyricum, which was situated between Rome and Constantinople, from the jurisdiction of the former, and had subjected it to the latter, Leo laid claim to that province, and made Anastasius bishop of Thessalonica his vicar in it.

But he gained a great accession of power on occasion of the following disputes in Gaul. Hilary of Arles, and Germain of Auxerre, coming, in a journey which they made together, to a city in the province of Vienna, of which Celidonius was bishop, the people of the place accused him before them of having married a widow, and of having condemned some persons to death when he was a magistrate. In consequence of this, these bi-
shops

bishops assembled others in that neighbourhood, and it was agreed among them that Celidonius should of his own accord resign his bishopric. But he appealed to the pope, who, in a council of his bishops in Italy held A. D. 444, ordered him to be reinstated.

Farther, complaint being made of an irregular ordination by Hilary, Leo procured an order from another of his synods that he should no more exercise any authority in his own province, or even be present at any ordination; and interesting Valentinian in his favour, he procured the following law, dictated, it is supposed, by himself.

“ It is certain that the only safeguard of our empire is the favour of the supreme Deity, which is secured by the christian faith, and true religion. Considering then that the merit of St. Peter, who was the prince of bishops, the dignity of the city of Rome, and the authority of the sacred synod, have established the supremacy of the apostolical see, let nothing be attempted against its authority. For then only will the peace of the churches be preserved when the universe acknowledges its governor.” Then, having condemned Hilary of Arles for having ordained some bishops without consulting the pope, he says, “ we have decreed by a perpetual ordinance,
“ that

SEC. IX. CHRISTIAN CHURCH. 517

“ that neither the bishops of Gaul, nor those of
“ the other provinces, do any thing without the
“ authority of the venerable pope of the eternal ci-
“ ty ; but that whatever shall be ordered by the
“ authority of the apostolical see, shall be a law to
“ all others ; so that whoever of the bishops, on
“ being summoned, shall neglect to appear before
“ the tribunal of the Roman prelate, he shall be
“ compelled to make his appearance by the go-
“ vernor of the province, &c.*”

By this law an end was put to the ancient liberties of the Gallican churches. From this time appeals to Rome from all the churches became frequent, vicars, or legates, of the *holy see*, as it was called, were often seen beyond the Alps. But the churches in the East were never in subjection to the see of Rome. In what manner, after this great step made by Leo, the fall of the Roman empire in the West made way for the farther aggrandizement of the bishops of Rome, may be seen in a future period.

Thus far the Eastern and Western churches acted very much in concert, so that all the decrees of the general councils are considered as equally binding upon them both. But from this time the civil affairs of the West having little connection
with

* Le Sueur A. D. 445, Histoire des Papes, Vol. ii: p: 225, &c.

with those of the East, the two churches became wholly separated.

S E C T I O N X.

Of Writers within this Period.

CYRIL of Alexandria was nephew to Theophilus, the great persecutor of Chrysostom, as he himself was the great opposer of Nestorius. He was a very voluminous writer. Besides commentaries on many parts of scripture, we have of his seventeen books on worshipping in spirit and in truth, several tracts relating to the doctrine of the trinity against Nestorius, three paschal homilies, ten books against Julian, one against the anthropomorphites, and sixty one epistles.

Orosius, a presbyter of Tarraco in Spain was sent as ambassador to inform Austin concerning the Priscillianists, and by him he was sent to Jerome in Palestine to ask his opinion concerning the origin of souls. There he attended two councils, in which he endeavoured to expose the heresy of Pelagius. The year after he returned to Africa with the relics of St. Stephen, and thence
he

he went to Spain, where, in pursuance of the request of Austin, he wrote his *history*, consisting of seven books, the object of which is to shew that the Romans suffered greater calamities while they were heathens, then after the empire became christian. He also wrote an apology against the Pelagians, on the freedom of the will, and a tract on the error of the Priscillianists and Origenists, which is prefixed to a book of Austin's against the former.

Theodoret was a native of Antioch, and was educated in a monastery near that city. Here he contracted an intimate friendship with Nestorius, and with John, afterwards bishop of Antioch. His masters are said to have been Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia, and Chrysostom. After being made deacon in the church of Antioch, he was ordained bishop of Cyrus, near the Euphrates, a district which abounded with heretics, whom he was indefatigable in converting. He boasted that he had baptized ten thousand Marcionites. We have seen the danger that Theodoret brought himself into by his attachment to Nestorius, and his opposition to Cyril; but being acquitted of heresy by Leo, bishop of Rome, he was restored to his see by Marcian. After the council of Chalcedon he applied himself to writing, and the works of few of the Fathers now extant are more valuable than his.

His commentaries on the scriptures have more good sense in them than any thing of the kind that has come down to us of the early ages. Besides these, we have of him five books of ecclesiastical history, as many of heretical fables, and a history of monks ; twelve books against the heathens, particularly Julian, ten orations concerning providence, four books of dialogues on the subject of the trinity ; seven other dialogues, two of them against the Anomœans, three against the Macedonians, and two against the Apollinarists ; and, lastly, thirty four epistles.

Cassian was of Scythian extraction, born at Athens. After being brought up from very early years among the monks of Bethlehem, he was made deacon by Chrysostom at Constantinople. On the expulsion of his patron he was sent by him to plead his cause with Innocent bishop of Rome. There he was made a presbyter, and upon the city being taken by the Goths, he went to Marseilles, where he founded two monasteries, one for men, and the other for women, and was a strenuous defender of the Semipelagian doctrine. We have of his a work in twelve books of monkish institutions, seven books of the incarnation of Christ against Nestorius, and collections from the Fathers.

Socrates was a native of Constantinople. He learned grammar of Helladius and Ammonius, who
fled

fled from Alexandria, as has been already mentioned, and rhetoric of Troilus the sophist. For some time he applied to the bar, whence he got the appellation of *Scholasticus*. He is the author of a, very valuable ecclesiastical history from the time of Constantine, to A. D. 439. This work bears the marks of great diligence and impartiality.

Hermias Sozomen, probably a native of Palestine studied the law at Berytus, and pleaded causes at Constantinople. He is also the author of an ecclesiastical history, of nearly the same period with that of Socrates. But though his work is said to be written with more elegance, he is not generally thought to be quite so judicious. I do not think, however, that, in this respect, his history is much inferior to that of Socrates.

Leo, surnamed the Great, was one of the most considerable writers, as well as actors, of his age. He was a native of Rome, and being deacon of the church under Celestinus, he urged Cassian to write against Nestorianism. A. D. 429, he was sent to compromise a difference which had taken place between Aetius and Albinus, the Roman generals in Gaul; and in his absence he was chosen bishop of Rome, A. D. 440, at a time when the Pelagian, Nestorian, and Eutychian controversies were warmly agitated. All these sects, as well as that of the Manichæans (many of whom fled to Rome from the
the

the persecution of the Vandals in Africa) he opposed with the greatest firmness.

A. D. 452, Leo, was sent by Valentinian to meet Attila, who was upon his march to invade Italy, and he prevailed upon him to return and settle beyond the Danube. He also prevented the utter destruction of Rome, when it was taken by Genseric, A. D. 455, and while he was intent upon compromising the differences of the church in the East, he died, A. D. 461. His zeal as a christian bishop would have been deserving of the highest commendation, if it had not been accompanied with an equal desire to extend the authority of his see, and had he not, on all occasions, behaved with a haughtiness unbecoming the proper episcopal character,

His writings consist of *sermons* and *epistles*, the former on various subjects, and the latter on many of the important events of his time. The subjects of them all may be seen in Dupin*.

Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius the younger was the author of the Greek canto's vi. 498.

* Vol. iv. p. 81, &c.

A VIEW

A VIEW of the SUCCESSION of the ROMAN EMPERORS, and of the BISHOPS in the greater Sees to the Fall of the WESTERN EMPIRE.

EMPERORS.	BISHOPS of ROME, of JERUSALEM, of ANTIOCH, of ALEXANDRIA, of CONSTANTINOPL.
14 Tiberius	
37 Caligula	
41 Claudius	42 Evodius
	Marc
34 Nero	
	67 Linus
68 Galba	
69 Otho Vit. Vespasian	68 Ignatius
79 Titus	
81 Domitian	Simeon
	Justus
	Zacchæus
96 Nerva	Tobia
98 Trajan	Benjamin
	John
	Matthias
	Philip
	Simeon
	Justus II.
	Levi
	Ephrem.
	Joseph
117 Adrian	
	107 Heron
	110 Primus
	122 Justus
	128 Cornelius
	100 Evaristus
	91 Clemens
	108 Alexander
	116 Sixtus
	126 Telephorus
	78 Anacletus

The Succession of Roman Emperors and of Bishops.

EMPERORS.

BISHOPS of ROME, of JERUSALEM, of ANTIOCH, of ALEXANDRIA, of CONSTANTINOPL.

138 Antoninus Plus

137 Hyginus

141 Pius

Judas
135 Marc

142 Heros II.

143 Marc II.
153 Celadion

161 Marcus Aurelius

157 Anicetus

168 Soter
177 Eleutherius

167 Agrippinus

168 Theophilus

180 Commodus

179 Julian

193 Pertinax, &c.
194 Severus

192 Victor

201 Zephyrinus

211 Caracalla
217 Macrinus
218 Helogabalus

211 Asclepiades

219 Calixtus

222 Alessand. Severus

220 Philetus

224 Urban

The Succession of Roman Emperors and of Bishops.

<i>EMPERORS.</i>	<i>BISHOPS of ROME, of JERUSALEM, of ANTIOCH, of ALEXANDRIA, of CONSTANTINOPLÉ</i>
235 Maximin	231 Pontianus
236 Gordian	235 Anterus
237 Max. Pupienus.	236 Fabianus
Balbinus	
244 Philip	237 Babylas
	248 Dionysius
249 Decius	249 Alexander
251 Gallus	250 Fabius
	251 Cornelius
254 Emilian, Valerian, Gallienus	252 Mazabenus
	253 Lucius
	255 Stephen
	257 Sixtus
	259 Dionysius
268 Claudius	260 Hymenæus
270 Aurelian	260 Paulus Samosat.
275 Tacitus	264 Maximus
276 Probus	269 Domnus
	271 Timæus
282 Carus	281 Cyril
	283 Theon.

The Succession of Roman Emperors and of Bishops.

EMPERORS.

284 Diocletian, &c.

296 Marcellinus

304 Mercellus

309 Eusebius

311 Melchiades

312 Silvester

336 Marcus, Julius

337 Constantius,
Constans
Constantine
Junior

352 Liberius

BISHOPS of *ROME*, of *JERUSALEM*, of *ANTIOCH*, of *ALEXANDRIA*, of *CONSTANTINOPLE*

298 Zambdas

302 Hermon

303 Tyrannus

300 Peter

306 Constantine

312 Macarius

311 Achillas

312 Alexander

313 Alexander

Metrophanes

315 Vitalis

319 Philogonus

323 Eustathius

326 Athanasius

329 Paulinus

330 Eulalius

331 Maximus III,

332 Euphronius

336 Paulus

343 Stephen

348 Leontius

341 Macedonius

351 Cyril

351 Eusebius

The Succession of Roman Emperors and of Bishops.

EMPERORS.	BISHOPS of ROME, of JERUSALEM, of ANTIOCH.	of ALEXANDRIA,	of CONSTANTINOPOLE.
361 Julian			360 Eudoxius
363 Jovian			
364 Valentinian, Valens			
367 Gratian	367 Damasus		370 Evagrius
375 Valentinian II.		373 Peter II.	
379 Theodosius			380 Gregory 382 Nectarius
	385 Siricius	381 Flavianus 389 Evagrius 392 Flavianus	381 Timotheus 385 Theophilus
395 Arcadius, Honorius	386 John II.		
		404 Alexander	397 Chrysostom
	398 Anastasius 402 Innocent		404 Arsacius 405 Atticus
408 Theodosius II.			
	416 Praxas	412 Cyril	
	417 Zozimus 418 Boniface		
423 Valentinian III.	423 Celestinus	419 Theodorus	426 Sisinnius

The Succession of Roman Emperors and of Bishops.

EMPERORS.	BISHOPS of ROME,	of JERUSALEM,	of ANTIOCH,	of ALEXANDRIA,	of CONSTANTINOPLA
	429 Juvenal		427 John		428 Nestorius
	431 Sixtus III				431 Maximian
					434 Proclus
	440 Leo		436 Damas		
				444 Dioscorus	447 Flavian
					449 Anatolius
450 Marcian			451 Maximus		
455 Maximus IV				453 Proterus	
457 Leo			456 Basil	457 Timotheus Alerus	458 Gennadius
		428 Anastasius	458 Acacius		
			459 Martyrius	460 Timotheus Salo- faciolus-	
461 Severus W	451 Hilary				
467 Anthimus W	467 Simplicius				
471 Leo, juu. Zeno				471 Peter Pullo	471 Acacius
475 Augustulus W					
		477 Martyrius			
			486 Stephen II.	482 Peter Mongus	484 Flavian

W. in this table, signifies emperor of the West.

N. B. No notice is taken by the author from which this table is extracted of Euzoius the Arian bishop of Antioch, in the time of Constantius and Valens; or of Melitius the Trinitarian bishop, who had a church different from that of Paulinus, A. D. 339.

T H R

I N D E X.

N. B. The Roman numerals signify the *volume* and the others the *page*. When the page is only noted, the first volume is to be understood, except the second is expressed before, in the same article.

A

ADRIAN, the emperor, favourable to the christians, 185.

Actius, his history, ii. 144; condemned by Constantius, 167 dies 403.

Agabus, a christian prophet, 62.

Agrippa, made king of the Jews, 55 persecutes the christians, 65. his death, 67.

—— the younger, made king of the Jews 67; hears Paul, 117.

Alaric, invades Italy, ii. 446.

Alexander, Severus, favourable to the christians, 264.

——, bishop of Jerusalem, a martyr, 314.

——, —— of Alexandria, opposes Arius, ii. 24.

Alexandria, a council held there in favour of Athanasius, ii. 112; an insurrection of the heathens there in the time of Theodosius, 384; disturbances there in the time of Cyril, 441.

Ambrose, made bishop of Milan, ii, 325; refuses the communion to Theodosius, 378, his writings 472.

Ammonius, the master of Origen, his writings, 297.

Amphilochius, determines Theodosius in favour of the doctrine of the trinity, ii. 37.

Ananias and Sapphira, 35.

Anatolius, his writings, 368.

Anomæans, their rise, ii. 143.

Anthony, the monk, writes
in

- in favour of Athanasius, ii. 66. his history 192, miracles ascribed to him, 192.
- Antioch*, a council held there against Athanasius, ii. 113; the creed made there, 115; a second council held there, its creed, 121; a synod held there in the time of Jovian, 294; a schism there between Paulinus and Meletius, 277; an end put to it, 360; an insurrection there in the time of Theodosius, 377.
- Antoninus Pius*, favours the christians, 207.
- Apelles*, A Gnostic, 280.
- Apollinaris*, his heresy, ii. 330; condemned at Alexandria, 278; at Constantinople, 366, his writings, and his son's, 251, 353.
- Apollonius*, a Roman senator, suffers martyrdom, 260.
- , another, his writings, 292.
- *Tyanæus* 370 miracles ascribed to him 370.
- Apologies* for christianity, presented to Marcus Aurelius 211.
- Apostolical Constitutions*, ii. 356.
- Aquila and Priscilla*. Paul meets with them, 89.
- . the Jewish writer, 233.
- Arcadius*, succeeds to the empire, ii, 422; dies, 440.
- Arianism*, the rise of it, ii. 19; reflections on the progress of it, 174; received by the Northern nations, 179.
- Arians*, their history after the council of Nice, ii. 57; how divided in the time of Julian, 281; in the reign of Theodosius, 401; at the accession of Arcadius, 423; under Honorius, 453; their singing in the time of Chrysostom, 454; join the Trinitarians at Synada in Phrygia, 454; Timotheus and George eminent men among them, 455.
- Ariminum*, the council held there, ii, 152.
- Aristides*, his apology for christianity, 187.
- Arrianus*, his friend, ii. 25; writes to Eusebius of Nicomedia, 28; banished 49; recalled 59; dies 70.
- Arles*, council there against the Donatists, ii. 17; against Athanasius, 144.
- Arnobius*, his writings, ii. 208.
- Arsacius*, succeeds Chrysostom, ii. 437.
- Athanasius*, at the council of Nice, ii. 43; chosen bishop

bishop of Alexandria, 63; deposed by the council of Tyre 65; appeals to Constantine, 65; banished, 66; returns, 111; banished by the council of Antioch, 114; flies to Rome, 117, restored 129; banished again, and escapes with difficulty, 136; persecuted by Julian, 230; holds a synod at Alexandria, 277, escapes from the persecution of Julian, 281; favoured by Jovian, 292; withdraws from his see in the time of Valens, but invited him to return, 308; his death, 312; his writings 352.

Athenagoras, his writings, 212, 257.

Attila, ii. 521.

Audeans, ii. 72.

Augustulus, the last Roman emperor, ii. 523.

Aurelian, a persecutor, 327.

Austin, opposes the Pelagians, ii. 464: his history and writings, 477.

Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan, deposed ii. 325.

B.

Babylas, of Antioch, his body removed into the city, ii. 263.

Baptism, its primitive state, 480.

Bardesanes, his writings, 257.

Barnabas, sent to Antioch, 62; the epistle that bears his name, 200.

Barsumas, a monk, favourer of Eutyches, ii. 497.

Bartbolomew, his history, 131.

Basil, his early history, ii. 316; his writings, 354.

Basilicus, a favourer of Eutychianism, ii. 513.

Beryllus, the Unitarian, 288, 295.

Bishops, the persecution of them under Diocletian, 392; their primitive state, 473.

Boniface, his martyrdom, 433.

Britain, Pelagianism introduced there, and expelled. ii. 470.

C.

Caius, a writer against the Unitarians. 283. 295.

Calama, the christians insulted by the heathens there, ii. 451.

Caligula, made emperor, 54.

Cassian, in France, ii. 469. his history and writings, 530.

Catechumens, 477.

Cerdon, the Gnostic 198.

Cerinthus, a Jewish Gnostic, 196.

Cestius.

Cestius Gallus, the Roman governor, 147.

Chalcedon, the council held there against Eutyches, ii. 500.

Chrism, 482:

Christ, the first opinion of christians about him, 162.

Christianity, in what light it would appear to the Jews and Gentiles, 72.

Christian church, the constitution of it before the time of Constantine, 473.

Christians, leave Jerusalem at the siege by Titus, 151.

Chrysanthius, an eminent Novatian bishop, ii. 457; his writings, 497.

Chrysostom, his history, ii. 424; his quarrel with Severianus, 428; with the empress, 433, deposed, ib. restored, 434; provokes the empress again, 435; finally banished, 437; his death, 440; his writings, 480.

Church government, its primitive state, 172.

Churches, their ornaments in the time of Theodosius, ii. 416.

Claudius, made emperor, 65.

Clementine Homilies, 245.

Clemens of Alexandria, his writings, 293.

——, of Rome, his epistle, 201.

Celestis, or *Astarte*, her

temple demolished, ii. 450.

Commodianus, a writer, 365.

Commodus, the Roman emperor, 260.

Confessors, who they were, 331.

Constantine, puts an end to the persecution of the christians, 409; revolutions in the empire, previous to the settlement of it under him, 446; his edicts in favour of christianity, ii. 4; his proceedings against the heathens, 7; his attempts to compose the Arian controversy, 33; favours the Arians, 59, his measures to suppress heresy, 72; circumstances attending his death, 82; of the sign of the cross seen by him in the heavens, 90; his writings, 211.

——, *Junior*, his religious principles, ii. 107; favours Athanasius, 111; ies, 112.

Constantinople, a council called there by Constantius, ii. 162; another by Theodosius, 362; another in favour of Chrysostom, 435.

Constantius, made emperor, ii. 104; his aversion to the Anomeans, 146; visits Rome, 149; his behaviour

- behaviour at the second council of Constantino-
ple, 162 ; his death and
character, 181.
- Constans*, his religious prin-
ciples, ii. 107 ; favours
Athanasius, 121 ; his
death, 131.
- Consubstantial*, the term re-
probated at the council
of Antioch, 359 ; the
meaning of it, ii. 71.
- Cornelius*, his conversion,
58.
- Councils*, their origin, 478 ;
the great number of them
in the time of Constanti-
us, ii. 109 ; the first idea
of the members of them
being inspired, 502, the
four œcumenical ones,
observations concerning
them, 514.
- Creed*, the word *filioque*
added to it, ii. 338.
- Customs*, the great variety
of them in the time of
Theodosius, ii. 407.
- Cyprian*, his martyrdom ;
321, the opposition made
to him, 333, his writings,
364.
- Cyril of Alexandria*, oppo-
ses Nestorius, ii. 487, his
triumph over him, 493,
his writings, 528.
- , of *Jerusalem*, his
writings, ii. 354.
- D.
- Damasus*, a sedition at
Rome at his election, ii.
324 347.
- Daphne*, a temple of Apollo
there burned down, ii,
264.
- Deacons*, the seven appoint-
ed, 38 ; their office 476.
- Dead*, the opinion of the
state of them in the time
of Theodosius, ii. 419.
- Decius*, the persecution of
christians by him, 305.
- Didymus of Egypt*, an emi-
nent trinitarian, ii. 313.
- Diocletian*, the persecution
of christians by him, 375
382, a stop put to it, 398,
renewed, 401 ; ended by
Constantine, 409 ; gener-
al reflections upon it,
451.
- Diodorus of Tarsus*, mas-
ter of Theodosius of
Mopsuestia, ii. 424.
- Dionysius of Alexandria*,
his account of the perse-
cution by Decius, 307,
his wonderful escape,
313, his sufferings under
Valerian, 320, his writ-
ings, 366.
- Divination*, of the heathens
to discover the successor
of Valens, ii. 335.
- Doctrines*, of the primitive
church, 485.
- Domitian*, the persecution
of christians by him,
176.
- Donatists*, their rise, 460.
- Con-

- Constantine's proceedings against them, ii. 15, in the reign of Constantius, ii. 188, in the reign of Julian, 234. of Valens, 344, hold a council at Carthage, 346, in the reign of Theodosius, 405, of Honorius, 459.
- Dorotheus*, a martyr 383.
- Doxology*, a new form of it introduced at Antioch, ii. 172.
- E.
- Easter*, the controversy concerning it 276, settled at the council of Nice, ii. 49, how observed in primitive times, i. 484. different customs respecting it, ii. 407.
- Ebionites*, Eusebius's account of them, 282
- Edessa*, Valens's cruelties there ii. 311.
- Egypt*, the persecution there under Diocletian 385.
- Elcesaites* 289.
- Ephesus*, council held there ii. 489, a second 496.
- Ephrem*, the Syrian, his writings ii. 354.
- Epiphanius*, takes a part against Chrysostom, ii. 432, his writings 355.
- Eunomians*, leave the other Arians, ii. 177, change form of baptism 332, divided among themselves, 401.
- Eunomius*, brought from Egypt by Aetius, ii. 164, made bishop of Cyzicum, 167, leaves Cyzicum, 177, 302; his history in the reign of Theodosius, 401.
- Eusebius of Casarea*, his conduct at the council of Nice, ii. 48; dies 111, his writings 209.
- of *Emesa*, his history, ii. 114.
- Eusebius of Nicomedia* favours Arius, ii. 29; banished by Constantine, 51; recalled, 61; dies, 118.
- Eustathius*, of *Antioch*, deposed by the Arians ii. 62.
- , of *Sebaste*, his severity condemned, ii. 190.
- Eutyches*, who, ii. 495; his history after the council of Chalcedon, ii. 506.
- Eutychianism*, its rise, ii. 495; its prevalence, 508; its history subsequent to the accession of Leo, 510.; its reception at Antioch and Alexandria, 511.
- Eutychius*, an Eunomian, and founder of a new sect, ii. 403.
- Eudocia*, her writings 532.
- F.
- Fabian*, bishop of Rome, his martyrdom, 314.

- Fasts*, in the primitive church, 483.
Felicissimus, his opposition to Cyprian, 334.
Felix, examines Paul, 114;
 —, a martyr in Africa, 389.
Festivals, in the primitive church, 484.
 ———, *heathen*, converted into christian ones, ii. 418.
Festus, hears Paul 115.
Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, ii. 496; his death, 497.
 ———, and *Diodorus*, zealous trinitarians at Antioch, ii. 173.
Florus, the Roman Governor of Judea, 146.
Fullo, Peter, a favourer of Eutychianism, ii. 511; made bishop of Antioch, 512.
- G.
- Gallienus*, a friend to the christians, 324; calamities of the empire under him. 326.
Gallus, nephew of Constantius, put to death, ii. 142.
Gemael, his advice 28.
George, of Cappadocia made bishop of Alexandria, ii. 117; murdered, 227.
Gibbon, Mr. his observations on the conversion of Constantine censured, ii. 97; his account of the persecution of Athanasius, 135.
Gildon, favours the Donatists, ii. 460.
Gnostics, their first appearance, 165; their principles, 167; in the reign of Adrian, 192; afterwards 280.
Goths, many of them converted to christianity in the time of Valens, ii. 334.
Gratian, his death, ii. 374.
Gregory of Nazianzum, his history, ii. 316, his writings, ii. 355.
 —, of *Neocæsarea*, his writings ii. 406.
 —, of *Nissa*, his writings ii. 355.
 —, — his account of pretended miracles ii. 200.
- H.
- Heathenism*, the nature of it 3. observations on the state of it in the reign of Julian, ii. 212, after his death 283, in the reign of Theodosius, 384 390, his endeavours to suppress it, 392, in the time of Honorius 448, exterminated by the Vandals in Africa 525.
Hegesippus, his account of the Gnostics, 197, his writings 252.
Heretics, the controversy about

- Leonidas* the father of Ori-
gen, beheaded, 262.
Libanius, his encomium on
Julian, ii. 290.
Liberius, bishop of Rome,
his treatment of Athana-
sius, ii, 141. by Con-
stantius, 149 submits to
the emperor, and de-
clares against Athanasius,
151.
Licinius, revives the perse-
cution of the christians,
411.
Lord's Supper, primitive
method of administering
it, 482.
Lucifer, of *Cagliari*, in E-
gypt, ii 276 ; goes to An-
tioch, 277.
Luke, his gospel, 132.
Lyons, and Vienne in Gaul,
martyrs there, 220;
M.
Macarii, their writings, ii.
353.
Macedonius, made bishop
of Constantinople, ii.
119. persecutes the trini-
tarians, 137, deposed,
162.
Malta, Paul shipwrecked
there, 118.
Manichæans, an account of
them, 466.
Marcus of *Ancyra*, de-
posed by the Arians, ii.
68, restored. 127.
——, of *Apanica*, mur-
dered by the heathens,
ii. 387.
Marcian, made emperor,
ii. 499.
——, the Gnostic, 198.
Marcus Aurelius, persecutes
christians, 210.
Maris, bishop of Chalce-
don, Julian's behaviour
to him, ii. 243
Mark, his gospel, 132.
Martin, bishop of Tours,
his pretended miracles ii
202.
Martyrdom, reflections up-
on it, 428.
Martyrs, respect paid to
them, 329.
Mary, the *Virgin*, honours
paid to her, ii. 494.
Massada, taken, 157.
Matthew, his gospel, 131.
Maximian, his rescript put-
ting a stop to the perse-
cution, 299
Maximinists, a sect of Do-
natists, ii. 405.
Maximilian, a martyr in
Africa, 388.
Maximin, persecutes the
christians, 265, 449, his
rescript to the people of
Tyre, 403, dies, 411.
——, declares himself em-
peror in Britain, ii. 373.
Maximus, a soldier and
martyr, 325.
——, the philosopher, how
received by Julian, 223,
his death, 338.

Mele-

Meletians, their rise, 460,
how treated at the coun-
cil of Nice, ii. 50, res-
tored to the favour of
Constantine, 61.

Melito his writings, 212
255.

Milan, the council there
under Constantius, ii.
147.

Millenium, the contro-
versy concerning it,
361.

Minutius Felix, his writ-
ings, 304.

—— *Fundanus*, Adrian's
rescript addressed to him
187.

Miracles, pretensions to
begun to be advanced ii.
161.

Monks, their origin, 312
in the reign of Constan-
tius, ii. 189. their or-
thodoxy, 333, of Egypt,
persecuted by Valens,
313, their anthropomor-
phitism, and dislike of
Origin, 429.

Manophysites their doctrine
ii. 498. advanced by
Theophilus, 498. sup-
ported by Cyril, 498..

Montanism, 228.

Musanus; his writings,
256.

N.

Nectarius, changes the dis-
cipline of the church of
Constantinople, ii. 413.

Nepos, a Milenarian, 361.

Nero, persecutes the chris-
tians, 133.

Netorianism, ii 482.

Nestorius, his history, ii.
484. his banishment and
death, 493. appeals &c,

——, appeals to Leo, 504

Noiclaitans, 196.

Nice, the council held there,
ii 37.

——, in Thrace a coun-
cil held there, ii. 156.

Nicene creed, ii, 44.

——, *faith*, where held in
the time of Valens, ii.
314.

Noctus, an Unitarian, 353,

Novatians, how treated at
the council of Nice, ii.
51, in the time of
Valens. 343, their divi-
sions in the time of The-
odosius, 404, in the time
of Arcadius, 456, suffer
at Alexandria, ib. at
Rome, 458.

Novatianism, the rise of it
333

Novatus of Africa, 333.

——, of Rome, 333; his
writings, 365.

O

Oracles, encourage Julian
to march against the Per-
sians, ii, 266.

Origen, his history and
writings, 297, his suffer-
ings under Decius, 314;
some

some of his disciples
 martyrs, 262:

Origenists, their rise, ii,
 430.

Orosius, his history and
 writings, ii. 548.

P

Pagans, origin of the name
 ii, 13.

Palestine, martyrs there in
 the time of Diocletian,
 413.

Pamphilus, his martyrdom,
 424.

Pantæus, his writings, 293.

Paphnutius, his behaviour
 at the councils of Nice,
 ii, 50.

Papias, his writings, 202.

Parmenian, a celebrated
 Donatist, ii, 346 405.

Peripatetians, 242.

Paul, the apostle, his first
 appearance, 41, his con-
 versation, 48, preaches,
 in Arabia, 52; his trance
 67; his apostolical jour-
 ney, 68, his second, 78;
 passes into Greece, 81;
 at Athens, 86; at Co-
 rinth, 89; writes to the
 Thessalonians, 92; to the
 Galatians, 93; his third
 journey, 96; at Ephesus
 97; writes to the Co-
 rinthians, 99; to Timo-
 thy, 102, to Titus, 102;
 the second epistle to the
 Corinthians, 103; to the
 Romans, 104; at Troas,

106, arrives for the last
 time at Jerusalem, 108;
 apprehended there, 111;
 sent to Rome 117; writes
 to the Ephesians, Phillip-
 pians, Colossians, and the
 second epistle to Timo-
 thy, 120; to Philemon,
 124; to the Hebrews,
 124; his death, 125.

—, *the first hermit*, 350.
 ii. 199.

—, *bishop of Constantino-
 ple*, ii. 112; banished,
 118; dies 133;

—, *of Samosata*, the U-
 nitarian, 356.

Paulinus, his writings, ii.
 476.

Pelagian controversy, the
 history of it, ii, 462.

Pelagians, the opposers of
 them in Gaul, ii. 471.

Penitents, their treatment,
 difference of opinion on
 the subject 328.

Pentecost, the gift of
 tongues on it, 28; ob-
 served by christians 484.

Peter the apostle, his curing
 a lame man, 31; impri-
 soned 37; raises Dorcas
 to life 57; released from
 prison by an angel, 66;
 temporizes at Antioch,
 75; his farther history,
 128; his epistles, 129;
 his death, 128.

Persia, a persecution of the
 christians in it, ii. 183.

Petilian

Petilian, a learned Donatist, ii. 461.

Perpetua, and Felicitas, their martyrdom 208.

Phileas, his epistle concerning the persecution by Diocletian, 387.

Philip the apostle, his history, 130.

——, the *deacon*, preaches in Samaria, &c. 43.

——, of *Crete*, his writings, 255.

Philosophers, heathen, their conduct in the persecution of christians, 395; how received by Julian, ii. 221.

Photinus, the Unitarian bishop of Sirmium, ii. 121; his behaviour at and after his condemnation, 138.

Phrygia, the persecution there under Diocletian, 390.

Pierius, his writings, 368.

Pilate, his memoirs fictitious, 402.

Plague, in the time of Galus, 308.

Plato, his three principles, 238.

Pliny the younger, his letter to Trajan, 181.

Polycarp, his epistle, 202; his martyrdom, 214.

Pontus, the persecution there under Diocletian, 391.

Presbyters, in the primitive church, 475.

——, *penitentiary*, abolished in the church of Constantinople, ii. 413.

Priscillianists, their history, ii. 394.

Procopius, rebels against Valens and is defeated, ii. 300, &c.

Proterius, made bishop of Alexandria, ii. 506; murdered, 509.

Public worship, in the primitive church, 479.

Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius II. prepossessed against Nestorius, ii. 493.

Pythagoras, miracles ascribed to him, 370.

Q.

Quadratus, his apology for christianity, 186.

R.

Relics, a law of Theodosius about them, ii. 419.

Revelation, the book of, 199.

Rhadagaisus, his defeat, ii. 446, 449.

Rhodon, his writings, 258.

Rites, what first used by christians, 171.

Rogatians, a sect of Donatists, ii. 406.

Rome, the luxury of its bishops in the time of Valens, ii. 348.

Ruffinus, his history and writings, 475.

S.

S.

- Sabellius*, an unitarian, 354.
Sapor, king of Persia, Constantine's letter to him in favour of the christians, ii. 13.
Saracens, many of them embrace christianity, ii. 335.
Sardica, the council there ii. 125.
Seleucia, a council held there, ii. 158.
Semipelagianism, ii. 469.
Serapion of Antioch, his writings, 294.
 —, of *Egypt*, shrunk from persecution and repented 315.
Sergius Paulus, converted by Paul, 68.
Severus, a persecutor of christians, 260.
Sibylline verses, 258.
Sicarii, among the Jews 144.
Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, a martyr, 183.
 — *Stylites*, ii. 511.
Simon Magus, 43. 46.
Singers Canonical; made an order of Clergy, ii. 421.
Singing, a new method of it introduced at Antioch, ii. 173.
Sirmium, the council held there to depose Photinus ii. 137. a second council held there, 150.
Sisinnius, an eminent Novatian bishop, ill treated by Chrysostom, ii. 426.
Sixtus, bishop of Rome, & martyr, 323.
Socrates Scholasticus, his writings, ii. 530.
Sophia Sancta, a church at Constantinople, dedicated, ii. 120.
Sozomen Hermias, his writings, ii. 531.
Stephen, the deacon, his death, 42.
Stilicho, his history, ii. 445.
Sulpicius Severus, his writings, ii. 480.
Superstition, the state of it in the time of Tertullian, 289.
Symmachus, the Ebionite, 253.
 ———— *the heathen*, pleads for his religion, ii. 388.
Synesius, his writings, ii. 481.

T.

- Tarachus*, and his companions, martyrs, 437.
Tatian, his writings, 256.
Temple, at Jerusalem, destroyed, 155.
Tertullian, his writings, 296.
Themistius, his commendation of Jovian, ii. 206, pleads for universal toleration, 314.
Theodoret, answers Cyril, ii. 488. his writings, 529.
Theodorus, of Mopsuestia, the master of Nestorius, ii. 424.

The.

Theodosius, made emperor, ii. 357. his endeavours to support the catholic faith 369. his severity to the people at Antioch, 376, at Thessalonica, 377, his useful regulations 379; his death and character, 380.

Theodosius II. takes the part of Nestorius ii. 491; dies, 499.

—, a bishop of Jerusalem, made by the Eutychians, ii. 507.

Theodotion, the Ebionite, 253.

Theognostus, his writings 368.

Theophilus, of Antioch, his writings, 255.

—, of Casarea, his writings, 292.

—, of Alexandria, his quarrel with the monks of Egypt, ii. 429; with Chrysostom, 432.

Theophilus of Alexandria, author of the doctrine of the Monophysites 498.

Throphronius, the successor of Eunomius, ii. 403.

Tiberius, the emperor dies 54.

Timotheus Ælurus, made bishop of Alexandria, ii. 509.

Titus, converted by Paul, 64.

— the emperor, lays siege to Jerusalem, 149.

Titus, of Bostra, unjustly treated by Julian ii, 231.

Traditors, who 462.

Trajan, persecutes the christians, 180.

Trinity, origin of the doctrine 237; carried to its proper extent ii. 319.

Trisagion, ii. 512.

U.

Unitarianism, the state of it in the time of Origen and afterwards, 351; in the time of Valens, ii. 341; of Theodosius 400.

Unitarians, in the third century 282; how treated at the council of Nice, ii. 53.

Ursacius, and *Valens*, chiefs among the Arians ii. 118; recant, ii. 130; their management at the council of Ariminum, 154.

V.

Valens, made emperor ii. 298; a violent Arian, 299 310; persecutes all but the Anomæans, 304, his cruelty, 310; his death 339.

—, bishop of Mursa. his behaviour at the battle fought near that place, ii, 132.

Valentinian, banished by Julian, ii, 216; made emperor, 298; events of his reign, 324; his death 328.

Valentinian II: succeeds to the empire, ii, 358 ; put to death, 376 ; his death revenged by Theodosius 376.

— *III*. succeeds to the empire, ii. 448 ; his law in favour of the bishop of

Rome, 526 ; his death 521.

Valentinus, the Gnostic, 198.

Valerian, a persecutor of the christians, 319.

Vandals, Arians, and persecutors of the Manichæans ii. 524.

ADDITION.

A D D I T I O N.

As I have given much at large the evidence of the primitive christian church having been Unitarian, in my *History of early Opinions concerning Christ*, I did not intend, in this work, to do any thing more than refer to *that* for the proof of every thing relating to that subject; but having quoted a few passages from the early christian writers, as my authorities for some of the articles, it may not be amiss to add a few in support of what is advanced, Vol. I. p. 315, of its having been acknowledged by the early trinitarian writers, that the doctrines of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ, were not taught with clearness and effect, before the publication of John's Gospel; and a very few will suffice for my present purpose. Those to whom they may not give satisfaction will find what cannot fail to give it in the large work from which these are extracted.

“ John alone,” says Origen*, “ introduced
“ the knowledge of the eternity of Christ, to the
“ minds of the Fathers.”

Eusebius sayst, “ John began the doctrine of
“ the divinity of Christ, that being reserved for
“ him, as the most worthy.”

Chrysoftom

* Opera, Vol. ii. p. 428. † Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. 24. p. 117.

A D D I T I O N.

Chrysoſtom writes the moſt copiouſly on this ſubject ; but I ſhall content myſelf with a very few paſſages from him. He ſays* “ John alone
“ taught the eternal, and ſuperceleſtial wiſdom.
“ John†, firſt lighted up the lamp of Theology.
“ and all the moſt diſtant churches, running to it
“ lighted up their lamps, and returned rejoicing,
“ ſaying *In the beginning was the logos.*” He re-
presents‡, all the preceding writers of the New
Teſtament as “ children, who heard, but did not
“ underſtand things, and who were buſy about
“ childiſh ſports. But John”, he ſays, “ taught what
“ the angels themſelves did not know before he de-
“ clared it.” Of the three firſt evangeliſts, he
ſays§, “ they all treated of the fleſhly diſpenſation,
“ and ſilently, by the miracles of Chriſt, indicat-
“ ed his dignity. The dignity of the logos of God
“ was hid, the arrows againſt the heretics were
“ concealed, and the fortification to defend the
“ right faith was not raiſed. John therefore, the
“ ſon of thunder, being the laſt, advanced the
“ doctrine of the divinity of Chriſt.”

* Johan. I. Opera, Vol. vi. p: 253.

† Ibid. p: 604.

‡ Opera, Vol. viii. p. 2.

§ De Sigillis, Opera, Vol. vi. p. 173:



3 2044 054 762 604

NOT TO BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

